Pārśvanātha Vidyāpīṭha Granthamālā : 75

General Editor
Prof. Sagarmal Jain

AN INTRODUCTION TO JAINA SĀDHANĀ

[JAINA WAY OF LIVING]

सच्चं लोगम्मि सारभूयं

By
Prof. Sagarmal Jain

पार्श्वनाथ विद्यापीठ, वाराणसी-५
PĀRŚVANĀTHA VIDYĀPĪṬHA, VARANASI-5

IMPORTANT NOTICE
The Readers are required to examine the book thoroughly at the time of issuing and bring any damage to the notice of the librarian, otherwise they shall be held liable for any damage discovered at the time of return of the book.
DIRECTOR

Acc. No. 1360
JAI
ganar-

DONATED
By
Mr./Mrs.....

55

Pārśvanātha Vidyāpīṭha Granthamālā : 75

General Editor
Prof. Sagarmal Jain

An Introduction to Jaina Sādhanā

[Jaina Way of Living]

(Lectures delivered under the auspices of Annual Lecture Series, 1992-93 at the Department of Jainology, University of Madras)

294.4
JAI
S2.12
BHARATIYA VIDYA BHAVAN
Acc No. 1360
Class No .....
PUBLIC LIBRARY - (DELHI)
S.V. 2014-2015
BVB
N.D.

by

Prof. Sagarmal Jain

M. A., Ph. D. (Philosophy)

Director

Pārśvanātha Vidyāpīṭha

Publisher

Pārśvanātha Vidyāpīṭha

Varanasi - 221 005

Published on behalf of the University of Madras

by

Pārśvanātha Vidyāpīṭha

I. T. I. Road, P. O. : B. H. U.

VARANASI - 221 005

Phone : 311462

First Edition 1995

Price : Rs. 40.00

$ 2

Typeset at

Naya Sansar Press

F 2/143 A, Bhadaini

VARANASI - 221 001

Printed at

an Printing Press

Jawahar Nagar

VARANASI - 221 010

Publisher's Note

Most of the religious as well as philosophical schools have accepted *Sādhanā,* as a means for the realisation of the ultimate end of our life. The word *Sādhanā* literally means 'a way to attain something' or means to an end . In restricted religious sense of the term *Sādhanā* is a systemetic course for self-discipline and practice for the removal of sorrow and sufferings of human life and attainment of salvation. In Jainism *Sādhanā* means the realisation of the real nature of our soul i. e., infinite knowledge, infinite perception, infinite bliss and infinite power which is obscured by *Karmas.* So long as the dominion of the *Karma* is not completely dissipated, the self cannot reach to its essential inherent purity and perfection. Jaina *Sādhanā* provides a well planned method or technique of physical, psychical, moral and spiritual discipline for the dissipation of the *Karmas* and revelation of the real nature of ones own self which is already there in.

We feel immense pleasure in bringing out this title "An Introduction to Jaina Sādhanā" authored by Dr. Sagarmal Jain. Present work is a compilation of the lectures delivered by Dr. Jain under the auspices of Annual Lecture Series 1992-93 at the Department of Jainology, University of Madras.

We are very grateful to the authorities of the University of Madras, who entrusted this work to our institute for publication.

Though there are number of books in English on different aspects of Jainism including the concept of *Sādhanā* but most of the works are scholarly monograph discussing the subject with its minute details and thus they are unable to attract

the comman readers. This work of Dr. Jain attempts to explain the Jaina *Sādhanā* and its relevance in the modern age, authentically and lucidly. We hope that the common readers will find it interesting and will appreciate the efforts of Dr. Jain. If this work arouses interest of readers in knowing more about Jaina *Sādhanā,* we shall consider our efforts worth while.

We are very thankful to Prof. Jain who delivered such a lucid lectures and prepared them for publication.

We are also very thankful to Prof. Surendra Verma, Dr. Ashok Kumar Singh and Dr. Shriprakash Pandey for editing and careful proof reading.

Our thanks are also due to Naya Sansar Press and Vardhaman Press who arranged its fine printing.

Secretary

B. N. Jain

Contents

Page

Chapter I *1 - 10*

Historical Development of Jaina *Sādhanā* 1, Hinduism and Jainism 2, Jainism and Buddhism 7.

Chapter II *11 - 17*

Antiquity of Jaina Tradition.

Chapter III *18 - 33*

The Main Objective of Jainism 18, The Cause of Bondage and Suffering 21, Process of Bondage 23, The Ultimate End : *Mokṣa* 24, The Nature of Self — (a) Nature of Self as Pure Knower 25; (b) *Samatā* as a Nature of Self 26, The Identity of Self with End and Means 31.

Chapter IV *34 - 46*

The Path of Liberation 34, Right View-point or Right Faith 35, Five Constituents of Right Faith 36, Six Places of Right Faith 37, Eight Limbs of Right Faith 37, Five Blemishes of Right Faith 38, Right Knowledge 38, *Matijñāna* 41, *Śrutajñāna* 41, *Avadhijñāna* 41, *Manaḥparyayajñāna* 41, *Kevalajñāna* 42, Relationship between Right Faith, Right Knowledge and Right Conduct 43, Right Conduct 44.

Chapter V *47 - 55*

Code of Conduct for House-holders 47, Twelve Vows 48, Essential Daily Duties 53, Eleven

Stages of Spiritual Progress of a House-holder 54.

Chapter VI *56 - 74*

Code of Conduct for a Jaina Monk 56, Six Great Vows 56, Five Types of Vigilance 56, Three *Guptis* 57, Control of Five Senses 57, Ten Cardinal Virtues 57, Six Essentials (*Ṣaḍāvaśyaka*) 57, Twelve Austerities 58, Twenty-two Hardships 58, Jaina-yoga and Other Systems of Yoga 58, The Spiritual Nature of Jaina Festivities 61, Altruistic Attitude of Jainism 63, Does Jainism teach the Negation of Life 64, *Guṇasthāna* 66, Three Stages of Spiritual Quest 72.

Chapter VII *75 - 86*

Relevance of Jaina *Sādhanā* 75, The Essence of Religion 75, Non-attachment and Regard for Other's Necessities 78, Non-violence or Regard for Life 78, Preservation of Ecological Equilibrium 82, Regard for Other's Ideologies and Faiths 84.

Bibliography *87 - 89*

Chapter I

Historical Development of Jaina Sādhanā

Jainism is one of the oldest living religions of the world. Though at present the number of its followers is not more than eight millions, it has a rich spiritual, cultural and literary heritage to its credit. Indian religious quest has two main trends — *Brāhmaṇic* and *Śramaṇic*. In the living world religions Jainism, as well as Buddhism, belong to the *Śramaṇic* trend. There were some other *Śramaṇic* religions also but either they like *Ājīvikas* disappeared in the course of time or they, like *Sāṅkhya-Yoga* and other ascetic systems of Hindu religions became part and parcel of great Hindu religion by adopting some tenets of *Vedic* religion.

Śramaṇic tradition is soteriological in its very nature. It lays special emphasis on renunciation of worldly belongings and enjoyments and on emancipation from worldly existence, *i.e.*, the cycle of birth and death. It may be accepted without any contradiction that these very ideas of emancipation (*Mokṣa/Mukti/Nirvāṇa/Kaivalya*) and renunciation (*Tyāga/Saṁyama/Vairāgya*) have been cultivated by the *Śramaṇas*. The asceticism is the fundamental concept of *Śramaṇic* tradition. It is on this ground that Jainism and Buddhism differ from the early *Vedic* religion. The early *Vedic* religion was against asceticism and emphasized the material welfare of the individual and the society. The *Vedic* seers in their hymns were praising the worldly existence and praying for their own health and wealth as well as of their fellow beings, while the *Śramaṇas* were condemning this worldly existence and propounding the theory that this

worldly existence is full of suffering and the ultimate end of human life is to get rid of this worldly existence, *i.e.*, the cycle of birth and death. Austerities, renunciation, emancipation, atheism, supremacy of human being over gods, equality of all beings, opposition of supremacy of Brahmins and of animal sacrifices and emphasis on moral values were some of the fundamental tendencies of *Śramaṇic* tradition. We also find that some of the above mentioned tendencies such as renunciation and emancipation were totally absent from the earlier form of *Vedic* religion. These concepts were contributed by the *Śramaṇas* to Indian culture in general and Hinduism in particular.

Hinduism & Jainism

However, these two distinct trends *Brāhmaṇic* as well as *Śramaṇic* have been prevalent in Indian Culture from its earliest days, yet in our culture, being a composite one, a water-tight compartment among its different shades is not feasible at all. We cannot understand Indian Culture completely without understanding its these two different constituents, *i.e.*, *Śramaṇic* and *Vedic*, developed later on in the form of Jainism, Buddhism and Hinduism. So one thing must be clear in our mind, that studies and researches in the field of Indology are not possible in isolation. In fact, Jainism, Buddhism and Hinduism are so inter-mingled and mutually influenced that to have a proper understanding of one, the understanding of other is essential. No doubt these different trends are distinguishable but, at the same time, we must be aware of the fact that they are not separable. Though on the basis of some peculiarities in theory and practice, we can distinguish them, yet it is very difficult to make a complete separation. Because none of these trends remained uninfluenced by one another. The earlier *Śramaṇic* trend and its later shades such as Jainism and Buddhism were influenced by the *Vedic* tradition, later developed in the form of

systems of *Hindū* philosophy. The concepts of *Tapas* or austerity, asceticism, liberation, meditation, equanimity and non-violence, which were earlier absent in *Vedas*, came into existence in Hinduism through *Śramaṇic* influence. The *Upaniṣads* and the *Gītā* evolved some new spiritualistic definitions of *Vedic* rituals. Both are the representatives of the dialogue which had taken place in *Śramaṇic* and *Vedic* traditions. The *Upaniṣadic* trend of Hinduism is not a pure form of *Vedic* religion. It incorporated in itself the various *Śramaṇic* tenets and gave a new dimension to *Vedic* religion. Thus, we can say that Hinduism is an intermingled state of *Vedic* and *Śramaṇic* traditions. The voice which was raised by our ancient *Upaniṣadic Ṛṣis* and *Munis* as well as *Śramaṇas* against ritualistic emphasis of *Vedic* tradition and worldly outlook of caste-ridden Brahminism, became stronger in Jainism, Buddhism along with the other minor *Śramaṇic* sects. Thus the *Upaniṣadic* trend as well as Jainism and Buddhism provided a resort to those, fed up with *Vedic* ritualism and worldly outlook towards life.

Not only Jainism and Buddhism but some other sects and schools of Indian thought such as *Ājīvikas* and *Sāṅkhyas* also adopted more or less the same view towards *Vedic* ritualism. However, Jainism and Buddhism were more candid and forthcoming in their opposition towards *Vedic* ritualism. They rejected outrightly animal-sacrifice in *Yajñas*, birth-based caste-system and the infallibility of the *Vedas*. In the form of Mahāvīra and Buddha, the most prominent rationalist preachers, we found the real crusaders, whose tirade against caste-ridden and ritualistic Brahminism, touching ever low water mark and crumpling with its inner inadequacies, gave severe jolt to it. Jainism and Buddhism came forward to sweep away the long accumulated excrescences grown on Indian culture in the form of rituals, casteism and superstitions. But we shall be mistaken

if we presume that in their attempt to clear off the dirt of *Vedic* ritualism, Jainism and Buddhism remained intact. They were also influenced by *Vedic* rituals considerably. Ritualism in the new form of *Tāntrika* rituals crept into Jainism and Buddhism and became part and parcel of their religious practices and mode of worship. With the impact of Hindu *Tāntrism*, Jainas as well as Buddhists adopted various Hindu deities and their mode of worship with some variations, which suited to their religious temperament but were alien to it in its pure form. Jaina concept of *Śāsanadevatās* or *Yakṣa-Yakṣīs* is nothing but only a Jaina version of Hindu deities. As I have pointed out earlier, the influence has been reciprocal. This can be discerned from the fact that on the one side Hinduism, accepted Ṛṣabha and Buddha as incarnation of God, while, on the other, Jainism included Rāma and Kṛṣṇa in its list of *Śalākā-Puruṣas*. A number of Hindu gods and goddesses were accepted as consorts of *Tīrthaṅkaras* such as *Kālī*, *Mahākālī*, *Cakreśvarī*, *Ambikā*, *Padmāvatī* and *Siddhikā* and some others as independent deities such as *Sarasvatī* and *Lakṣmī*. The moot point, I intend to come to, is that different religious traditions of our great Indian Culture have borrowed various concepts from one another. It is the duty of the scholars to study and highlight this mutual impact which is the need of the hour and thus to bridge the gulf that exists between different religious systems due to the ignorance of their interactions and the history of mutual impacts.

Though it is true that *Śramaṇic* tradition in general and Jainism and Buddhism in particular have some distinct features, discriminating them from the early *Vedic* or *Brāhmaṇic* tradition, yet they are not alien faiths. They are the children of the same soil, and they came forward with a bold reformative spirit. It would be a great mistake if we consider that Jainism and Buddhism were mere a revolt against Brāhminism or that they

are faiths alien to Hinduism. The Western scholars have committed a great mistake in highlighting this view, though they have done this intentionally to lay the foundation of enmity and disintegration to this great Indian Culture. But here I would like to say that it was not a revolt but a reformer's crusade. In fact *Vedic* and *Śramaṇic* traditions are not rival traditions as some of the Western and Indian scholars think but they are complementary to each other, because these two represent the two aspects of human existence — physical as well as spiritual. There has been a deliberate effort to creat a gulf between Jainism and Buddhism on the one hand and Hinduism on the other, by Western Scholars. Unfortunately, some Indian scholars, even Jaina scholars, supported their point of view, but in my humble opinion this was a false step taken in a wrong direction. It is true that *Śramaṇic* and *Vedic* traditions have divergent views on certain religious and philosophical issues, their ideals of living also differ considerably. But this does not mean that they are rivals or enemies of each other. As reason and passion, *Śreya* and *Preya*, inspite of being different in their very nature, are the components of the same human personality, so is the case with *Śramaṇic* and *Vedic* traditions. Though inheriting distinct features, they are the components of one whole Indian Culture. Jainism and Buddhism were not rivals to the Hinduism, but what they preached to the Indian society was an advanced stage in the field of spirituality as compared to *Vedic* ritualism. If the *Upaniṣadic* trend, inspite of taking a divergent stand from *Vedic* ritualism, is considered as a part and parcel of Hinduism and an advance towards spirituality, what is difficulty in measuring Jainism and Buddhism with same yardstick? Again, if *Sāṅkhyas* and *Mīmāṁsakas*, *Advaitists* and *Dvaitists*, inspite of having different philosophies and pathways belong to one and the same Hinduism, why not Jainism and Buddhism ?

If *Upaniṣadic* tradition is considered as an advancement from *Vedic* ritualism to spiritualism, then we have to accept that Buddhism and Jainism have also followed same path with a more enthusiastic spirit. They worked for the upliftment of the weaker section of Indian society and redemption from priesthood and ritualism. They preached the religion of common-man, which was erected on the firm footing of moral virtues, instead of on some external rituals.

Today, scholars working in the field of Jainology need a new approach to reinterpret the relationship between Jainism, Buddhism and Hinduism, particularly its *Upaniṣadic* trend, in the light of ancient Jaina texts of 4th and 3rd century B.C. such as *Ācārāṅga*, *Sūtrakṛtāṅga* and *Isibhāsiyāim*. I am sure that an impartial and careful study of these texts will remove the misconception that Jainism and Hinduism are rival religions. In *Ācārāṅga* we find a number of passages bearing affinity with those of *Upaniṣadas*, in their words and style as well as in essence. *Ācārāṅga* mentions *Śramaṇa* and *Brāhmaṇa* simultaneously and not as rivals. It proves that for the preacher of *Ācārāṅga*, *Śramaṇa* and *Brāhmaṇa* are not rivals to each other as is considered later on. In *Sūtrakṛtāṅga,* we find a mention of some *Upaniṣadic Ṛṣis* such as Videhanemi, Bāhuka, Asitadevala, Dvaipāyana, Pārāśara and some others. They were accepted as the *Ṛṣis* in their own tradition though they followed different codes of conduct. *Sūtrakṛtāṅga* addresses them as great ascetics and great men, who attained the ultimate goal of life, *i.e.*, liberation. *Isibhāsiyāim* (*Ṛṣibhāṣita*), which was formerly considered as a part of Jaina canon, also mentions the teaching of Nārada, Asitadevala, Aṅgirasa, Pārāśara, Aruṇa, Nārāyaṇa, Yajñavalkya, Uddālaka, Vidura and many others. They have been called as *Arhat Ṛṣis*. These references in the Jaina tradition prove the open-mindedness of Jainism on one hand, and on

the other hand that the stream of Indian spiritualism is one at its source, irrespective of getting divided later into *Upaniṣadic*, Buddhist, Jaina, *Ājīvika* and other rivulets. The work *Ṛṣibhāṣita* is a clear proof of the assimilative and tolerant nature of Indian thought. Today, when we are deeply bogged into communal separatism and strife, such great works could be an enlightening guide.

Thus, the position, these *Upaniṣadic Ṛṣis* held in early books of Jainism is a clear evidence which shows that the stream of Indian spiritualism is one at its source. We cannot have a proper understanding of these trends if we treat them in isolation. *Ācārāṅga*, *Sūtrakṛtāṅga* and *Ṛṣibhāṣita* may be understood in a better way only in the light of *Upaniṣadas* and vice-a-versa, similarly the *Suttanipāta Dhammapada*, *Theragāthā* and other works of Pāli canon can only be properly studied in the light of Prākṛta Jaina canon and the *Upaniṣadas*.

Jainism and Buddhism

As we have already mentioned Jainism and Buddhism, both belong to the same *Śramaṇic* tradition of Indian Culture. Mahāvīra, the 24th Tīrthaṅkara of Jainas was a contemporary of Gautama, the Buddha. Both flourished in the sixth and fifth century B.C., at a time when the simple nature worshiper of early *Vedic* religion became caste-ridden and ritualistic. Both were regarded as rebel children of Hinduism by Western thinkers, but really they were the reformers. They have given a spiritual meaning to the *Vedic* rituals and thus, founded a religion of self-purification and self-development. Sweeping away the long accumulated excrescences that had grown over Hinduism in the form of outmoded rituals, they also challenged the infallibility of the *Vedas* and undercut the indisputable superiority of the *Brāhmaṇas*. They were of atheistic nature and so they did not accept the concept of God as a creator and controller of the

world. They established the supremacy of man instead of the God and other deities and declared that no other being except man himself is the maker of his own destiny. It is only man who can attain even Godhood through his moral life and spiritual practices. For both of them every living being is capable to attain *Nirvāṇa, i.e.,* Godhood or Buddhahood. Both of them rejected the concept of grace of God. For them, it is our own self, which is solely responsible for misfortune as well as suffering. Thus they both accepted the supremacy of self and law of *Karma.* Moral code preached by Buddha and Mahāvīra, in its general sense, was also the same. Both preached five *Śīlas* or *Mahāvratas*, with only one difference, that in place of non-possession of Mahāvīra, Buddha preached non-consummation of intoxicative drugs.

The major differences between these two sister religions from the view-point of metaphysics and ethical code are following :

(i) The philosophical approach of Buddhism towards other philosophical doctrines was negative one, while that of Jainism was positive one. Lord Buddha preached that one should not fall in or accept any of the *dṛṣṭis*, *i.e.*, philosophical view-point, either it may be of eternalism or of nihilism, because none of them represents a right view-point, while Mahāvīra said that both the doctrines are partially true, if they are viewed from different angles; so one should not discard one's opponent's, view as totally false. For Jainas different opposite views may be acceptable from different angles. For Mahāvīra nothing was absolutely true or false and so he remained positive in his approach all the time. Secondly, while Buddhism laid stress only on the changing aspect of reality, Jainism gave due consideration to changing as well as eternal aspect of reality.

(ii) So far as moral and religious practices are concerned,

Jainism advocated rigorous and strict austerities in this regard, while Buddha condemned this rigorous outlook and pursued a middle path.

Though there was much similarity in the missions of Jainism and Buddhism, Buddhism flourished more on other soils than on its native land and established itself as a world religion. Jainism never had a firmfooting on the foreign soil. Jainism remained firmly rooted in India through all the periods of Indian history, while Buddhism was totally uprooted from its own soil of origin. Why did these two religions have the diametrically opposite fates? There were many reasons for this; to name the few, Buddhism found such royal patrons as Aśoka and Kaniṣka, who were fired with missionary zeal of spreading it outside India and had the territory of their empire across the Indian borders. Though Jainism also found some royal patrons as Candragupta Maurya, Khāravela and Kumārapāla, but they did not try for the expansion of Jainism on foreign soil. Moreover, the Jaina monks did not agree to go outside India, because it was very difficult for them to observe their strict code of conduct outside the country and they did not like to be flexible in their code of conduct. Another most important reason was that the Buddha had recommended the middle-path and remained flexible in prescribing the moral code for his monks and nuns throughout his life. This middle-path and flexibility made Buddhism more adaptable to foreign soil. But due to the same reasons Buddhism was so adopted by Hinduism that it could not retain its independent entity in India. First of all the middle-path of Buddha was not very far from the teachings of the *Gītā*. Not only this, the later developed Mahāyāna sect of Buddhism had very little to mark it out from the original stock of Hinduism. Secondly, the Buddha himself was accepted as the ninth incarnation of Viṣṇu. Thirdly, flexibility in moral-code made the life of Buddhist

monks so luxurious and corrupt in India that they could not retain the faith of common man. Jainism, on the other hand, throughout had a leaning towards extremism and remained strict and mostly inflexible in its moral code. That is why Jaina monks could not go and propagate Jainism across the boundaries of India. Fourthly, owing to its strict code of conduct even for a house-holder it was not easily adaptable for foreign people; for this very reason it could retain the faith of a common man and its own entity in India. Thus the extremism of Jaina religion on the one hand prevented its expansion in India and abroad, but on the other, it proved the sole cause of its survival in India. It is because of the strict austerities associated with Jainism that it remained a closed set, little understood beyond its adherents. Even the unusual absorbing power of Hinduism could not absorb it. This bespeaks of its originality which could withstand the challenge of Hinduism. Last but not least among the causes of extinction of Buddhism from the Indian soil was that Buddhism never tried to develop the order of laymen and lay-women. By the word order they mean the order of monks and nuns, while Jainism always laid stress on the fourfold order — the monks, the nuns, the laymen and the lay- women and that is why it did not lose its identity.

Thus the two parallel religions, which occurred against the same socio-religious background and began their journeys together, drifted wide apart and had altogether a different history. Buddhism died in India, but remained in China, Japan, Srilanka and many other countries; Jainism remained in India, neither expanding nor suffering from further shrinking.

●

Chapter II

Antiquity of Jaina Tradition

Antiquity of Jainism goes back to pre-historic period of Indian culture. In support of this view Prof. Zimmerman observed, there is truth in Jaina idea that their religion goes back to remote antiquity, the antiquity in question being that of the Pre-Aryan (Zimmerman : The Philosophies of India, p. 60). We find references of *Vrātyas* and *Arhatas* in *Ṛgveda* and *Atharva-veda*, the oldest texts of the Indian literature. These *Vrātyas* and *Arhatas* of *Vedic* period were the ancestors of Jainas. They were also known as *Śramaṇas* in *Upaniṣadic* period. Alongwith the references of *Vrātyas, Arhatas* and *Śramaṇas* in *Vedas* and *Upaniṣadas*, we find mention of some Jaina *Tīrthaṅkaras* such as Ṛṣabha, Ajita and Ariṣṭanemi in them. It is a certain proof that Jainism in its oldest form as *Vrātya* tradition was prevalent at the time of composition of *Vedas* hence its antiquity goes back to pre *Vedic* period, *i.e.,* at least three to five thousand years before Christian era. Secondly in Mohen-jo-daro and Harappa some seals of meditating *Yogīs* have been found, which show that the tradition of performing meditation and *Yoga-sādhanā* was present much more earlier in Indian Culture than the arrival of *Aryans* and their *Yajña* rituals because no *Yajña-vedī* was found in these excavations. In these earlier days, present Jainism was known as a *Vrātya-dharma* or *Arhat-dharma.*

In later times of *Upaniṣadic* period (*c*. 800 B.C.) the *Vrātyas*, *Arhatas* and *Śramaṇas* were divided into various religious school. At that time (*c*. 800 B.C. to 500 A.D.) Jainism was known as *Nirgrantha-dharma*. In Buddhist Pāli tripiṭaka,

ancient Jaina canon as well as in the pillar-edicts of Aśoka also the religion of Lord Pārśva and the Mahāvīra is mentioned in the name of *Nirgrantha-dharma*. Historicity of Lord Pārśva, the 23rd *Tīrthaṅkara,* is now well established and accepted by all the scholars. According to Jaina tradition the predecessor of Lord Pārśva was Ariṣṭanemi. He was the real cousin of Lord Kṛṣṇa. The Historicity of Ariṣṭanemi could also be established on the basis of the historicity of Lord Kṛṣṇa. If we belive that Lord Kṛṣṇa was a historic person, then we may also believe that the Ariṣṭanemi was also a historic person. We find his name not only in *Vedas* but in *Upaniṣadas* and Hindū *Purāṇas* also. Some scholars presented an inscriptional evidence to prove the historicity of Ariṣṭanemi (Neminātha). Dr. Prannath published in 'Times of India' (dated 19th March 1935) a Copper-plate grant of the Babylonian King Nebuchandnazzar (1140 B.C.) found at Prabhāsapaṭṭan in Gujrat. According to his reading this King having come to Mount Revata to pay homage to Lord Neminātha. Though his reading was not accepted by all the scholars, yet we cannot reject it as totally false, there are certain proofs in his reading. Lord Nami of Mithilā is also accepted as a Ṛṣi in *Upaniṣadic* and Hindū *Paurāṇic* tradition. So far as historicity of Lord Ṛṣabha is concerned, it is well established fact that not only his name but his life-story and teachings also occur in *Bhāgavat* and some other *Puraṇas*. According to Prof. Dalasukha Malavaniya, one of the well-read scholar of Buddhist canon, name of some Jaina *Tīrthaṅkaras* such as Ṛṣabha, Padma, Candraprabha, Puṣpadanta, Vimala, Dharma, Nami, Ariṣṭanemi and Mahāvīra also occur in Buddhist literature in the form of previous *Buddhas*, *Bodhisattvas* or *Pratyeka-buddhas*. Thus, it can be said with a degree of certainty that all the Jaina *Tīrthaṅkaras* are not legendary characters. Though it may be true that some legendary characteristics have been crept

into the life-stories of Jaina *Tīrthaṅkaras* presented in Jaina *Purāṇas*, yet their very existence can not be challenged. Whether we accept the historicity of Jaina *Tīrthaṅkara* or not, it is beyond doubt that the Jaina-ideas of renunciation, austerity, penance, self-mortification, non-violence, celebacy, meditation etc. were prevalent in the pre *Vedic* period. Sri Ramchandra observes — *Upaniṣads* represent the Brahmanical spiritual thought — they borrowed spiritual thoughts from their Pre-Aryan adversaries, now friends in a perverted manner — The *Śramaṇic* culture was ascetic, atheistic, pluralistic and realistic in content. This comes out clearest from a consideration of the earliest faith of the Jainas — one of the oldest living surviving sects of the *Munis*. The pre *Upaniṣadic* materialistic (Pravṛtti-Dharma) *Vedic* thought later evolved pseudo-spiritual thought (Nivṛtti-Dharma) mainly through the influences of the *Muni* or *Śramaṇa* culture, in pre-Buddhistic times, within its fold (Ramchandra Jain, The Most Ancient Aryan Society, pp. 48-49).

We must be aware of the fact that while the basic tenets, of Jainism in thought and practice, remained intact their explanations and applications were modified in confirmity with time and age by the Jaina *Tīrthaṅkaras* and *Ācāryas*. Every forthcoming *Tīrthaṅkara* made reforms and changes in previous ethical code and mode of religious practices as per the need of their age. As regards the ethical doctrines and religious practices of different *Tīrthaṅkaras*, it is mentioned in *Āvaśyaka Niryukti* (1258-1262) and some other commentaries of Jaina canonical texts that those of Lord Ṛṣabha, Ist *Tīrthaṅkara* and Lord Mahāvīra, last *Tīrthaṅkara*, were uniform while those of remaining *Tīrthaṅkaras* were different. There is a clear evidence in *Uttarādhyayana* (22/14-22) a Jaina text of early period that Lord Ariṣṭanemi had laid more stress on non-violence and even refused to get married due to slaughter of animals for his

marriage feast. Except this we find no other clues from Jaina sources regarding the difference of ethical doctrine and religious practices of other *Tīrthaṅkaras* on one hand and Mahāvīra on the other, with only exception of Pārśva. We find references in *Bhagavatī*, *Uttarādhyayaṇa* and *Ṛṣibhāṣita*, *Bṛhatkalpabhāṣya* which prove that teachings of Pārśva were at variance with Mahāvīra's.

Before we come to the difference between teachings etc. of Pārśva and Mahāvīra, a brief survey of what they have in common, will not be irrelevant.

The tradition of Mahāvīra borrowed much from Pārśva in field of Metaphysics and *Karma* philosophy. Both regard the world as eternal as well as dynamic, that it exists by itself and has no creator. They both also believe in the concept of permanence in-change as a nature of reality, the basis of Jaina theory of *Anekāntavāda*. The doctrines of five Astikāyas, of eight-fold *karmas*, as well as concepts of *Āsrava*, *Saṁvara*, *Nirjarā*, *Sāmāyika*, *Pratyākhyāna*, *Poṣadha* are also common in both the traditions. Though there were some minute differences in the details of these concepts in both the traditions. For example we come across with the difference of opinion about the nature of *Pratyākhyāna* between Gautama, the disciple of Mahāvīra and Udaka Pedhalaputta, the disciple of Pārśva in *Sutrakṛtāṅga* (Book II, Chapter 7th *Nālandīya*). Similarly, we may notice the differences of both the traditions in *Bhagavatī* and *Uttarādhyayana* in detail also. But all these differences are mostly related to the ethical code and mode of religious practices and not to the philosophy and fundamental ethical doctrines as such.

Pārśva propounded *Cāturyāma* (four-fold *Yamas*), while Mahāvīra preached the five *Mahāvratas* (Great-vows). Mahāvīra added celibacy as an idependent vow in the *Cāturyāma dharma*

of Pārśva. *Sūtrakṛtāṅga* mentions that Mahāvīra prohibited the woman and night-eating. The reason for this induction of celibacy by Mahāvīra among five-great vows is given in *Sūtrakṛtāṅga*. At the time of Pārśva woman was regarded as the possession or property, hence, prohibition of possession implied the prohibition of sexual relationship, for no one can enjoy the woman without possessing her. But as *Sūtrakṛtāṅga* informs at the time of Mahāvīra there were some *Pāsastha Śramaṇas*, who believe that the prohibition of possession did not mean the prohibition of sexual enjoyment. If an woman invites or offers herself for enjoyment to a *Śramaṇa* then the fulfilment of her sexual desire is not a sin just as the squeezing of a blister or boil (causes relief) for some time (and has no dangerous consequences) so is the case with (the enjoyment of) charming women. How could there be any sin in it ?

From this stanza it is clear that some *Śramaṇas* were interpreting the concept of non-possession in their own mischievious way and vow of non-possession ceased to be a device for observing complete celibacy. It meant that vow of non-possession in the context of celibacy, debarred keeping wives only. So Mahāvīra was compelled to add celibacy as an independent vow and to stress on the strict observance of this vow.

1. If we think on this question, historically, we find that ancient *Vedic Ṛṣis* were married and had sons and daughters. On one hand as regards, the concept of *Vānaprastha*, *Ṛṣis* had wives but would observe celibacy therein but on the other hand, Jaina canonical literature informs about those *Śramaṇas*, who regarded enjoying of woman, without possessing her as no sin. And that is why Mahāvīra have to add a separate vow of celibacy.

2. In Pārśva tradition repentance was not among monk's essential daily duty. A monk had to repent only at the instance

of committing sins or violating his vows. But Mahāvīra made repentance a daily-duty. A monk must repent every morning and evening irrespective of, whether he commits the sin and violates his vows or not. In *Sūtrakṛtāṅga*, *Bhagavatī* and other canonical works of Mahāvīra's tradition, it is mentioned as *sapratikramaṇa dharma*.

3. Pārśva did not advocate complete nakedness for monks instead he allowed one or two clothes for monks, while Mahāvīra made nudity a must for monk and so Mahāvīra's tradition is known as *Acela-dharma*. In commentaries of *Uttarādhyayana* we find that Pārśva allowed his *Śramaṇas* to wear the costly and colourful dress but we have no early textual support for it.

Besides, above three major distinctive features between the code of conduct of Pārśva and that of Mahāvīra, some minor differences also are found, as follows :

4. In Pārśva tradition a monk could accept the invitation for food and was also allowed to take the food, prepared for him, but for that of Mahāvīra it was strictly prohibited. In other words, in Mahāvīra's tradition a monk could neither accept the invitation for food nor could take that food prepared for him.

5. Pārśva allowed his monks to accept the meals prepared for the king, while Mahāvīra prohibited this also.

6. In Mahāvīra's tradition it is essential for the monk to keep on moving from one place to another. Except in rainy season he should not stay at one place for more than one month. But according to Pārśva tradition a monk could stay at one place so long as he wishes. In short, to keep on moving was essential in Mahāvīra's tradition, but it was optional in Pārśva's tradition.

7. Mahāvīra stressed that a monk should stay at one

place in the rainy season for four months while in Pārśva's tradition it was also optional.

8. According to Mahāvīra, first an aspirant should be initiated as probationary. After this period if he is found eligible, then he should be allowed to ordinate second time and his seniority is to be fixed accordingly in the *Saṅgha* (order of monks).

These are some distinctive features of Pārśva's ethical code and teachings which are clearly different from that of Mahāvīra. Though the ultimate goal of both the *Tīrthaṅkaras* was same and one.

●

Chapter III

The Main Objective of Jainism

The main objective of Jainism is to emancipate man from sufferings. It tries to track down sufferings to their very root. The famous Jaina text *Uttarādhyayana-sūtra* says :

Kāmāṇugiddhippabhavaṁ khu dukkhaṁ
savvassa logassa sadevagassa.
Jaṁ kāiyaṁ mānasiyaṁ ca kiñci
tassa antagaṁ gacchai vīyarāgo. (32. 19)

That the root of all physical as well as mental sufferings of everybody including the gods is the desire for enjoyment. Only a dispassionate attitude can put an end to them. It is true that materialism seeks to eliminate sufferings, through the fulfilment of human desires, but it cannot eradicate the primal cause from which the stream of suffering wells up. Materialism does not have at its disposal an effective means for quenching the thirst of man permanently. Not only this, its attempts at the temporary appeasement of a yearning, have the opposite effect of flaring it up like the fire fed by an oblation of butter. It is clearly noted in the *Uttarādhyayana-sūtra* :

Suvaṇṇa-rūpassa u pavvayābhave
siyā hu kelāsasama asaṁkhayā.
Narassa luddhassa na tehiṁ kiñci
iccha u āgāsasamā aṇantiyā. (9. 48)

That, even if an infinite number of gold and silver mountains, each as large as the *Kailāśa*, are conjured up, they would not lead to the final extinction of human desires, because desires are infinite like space. Not only Jainism but all spiritual

traditions unanimously hold that the root cause of sorrow is attachment, lust or a sense of mineness, but the fulfilment of desires is not the means of ending them. Though a materialistic perspective can provide for material prosperity, it cannot make us free from attachments and yearnings. Our materialistic outlook can be compared to our attempt of chopping the branches off while watering the roots of a tree. In the above mentioned *gāthā* it is clearly pointed out that desires are endless just as space (*Ākāśa*) and it is very difficult to fulfil all of them. If mankind is to be freed from selfishness, violence, exploitation, corruption and affliction stemming from them, it is necessary to outgrow materialistic outlook and to develop an attitude, which may be described as spiritual.

The word *Adhyātma*, the Saṁskṛta equivalent of spirituality derived from *adhi+ātmā*, implies the superiority and sublimity of *Ātmā*, the soul force. In the oldest Jaina text *Ācārāṅga* we find the word *ajjhathavisohi*, which connotes, inner purity. According to Jainism, the realisation of physical amenities or creature comforts is not the ultimate aim of life. There are some higher ideals of life which are over and above the mere biological and economic needs of life. Spirituality consists in realising these higher values of life.

Jaina spirituality teaches us that happiness or unhappiness is centred in the soul and not in worldly objects. Pleasure and pain are self-created. They are subjective in nature also. They do not depend totally on the objects, but depend also on the attitude of a person towards them. The *Uttarādhyayana-sūtra* mentions :

Appā kattā vikattā ya, duhāṇa ya suhāṇa ya
Appā mittamamittaṁ ca, duppaṭṭhiya-supaṭṭhio. (20. 37)

That the self (ātmā) is both the doer and the enjoyer of happiness and misery. It is its own friend when it acts righteously

and foe when it acts unrighteously. An unconquered self is its own enemy, unconquered passions and sense organs of the self are its own enemy. Oh monk ! having conquered them I move righteously.

In another Jaina text *Āurapaccākkhāṇaṁ* it is mentioned:

Ego me sasado appā, ṇāṇadaṁsaṇasamjuo
Sesā me bahirā bhāvā, savve samjogalakkhaṇā.
Samjogamūlā jīveṇaṁ, pattā dukkhaparamparā
Tamhā samjogasambandhaṁ, savvabhāveṇa vosire.
(26. 27)

That the soul endowed with knowledge and perception is alone permanently mine, all other objects are alien to it. All the serious miseries suffered by a self are born of the individual's sense of 'mine' or attachment towards the alien associations and so it is imperative to abandon completely the sense of 'mine' with regards to the external objects. In short, according to Jainism ceasing from identifying oneself with the objects not belonging to the soul, is the starting point of spiritual practice (*sādhanā*). Non-alignment with material object is the prerequisite for self-realisation. According to it, renouncement of attachment is the same as the emergence of a balanced view of even-sightedness (*samadṛṣṭitā*).

The reason for which Jainism regards abandonment of 'sense of mine' or of attachment as the only means for self-realisation is that so long as there is attachment in a man, his attention is fixed not on self or soul, but on not-self, *i.e.,* material objects. Materialism thrives on this object-oriented attitude or indulgence in the not-self. According to the Jaina philosophers, the identification with the not-self and regarding worldly object as a source of happiness or unhappiness, are the hallmarks of materialism. This is considered as a wrong view-point. The

right view-point regards the self as of supreme value and aims at the realisation of its quiddity or its ideal unconditioned state of pure knower, which is free from attachment and passions. It is mentioned in *Samayasāra* :

Evaṁ sammāithi appāṇam muṇadi jaṇagasahāvaṁ. (209)

that the self possessed of a right view-point realises the pure soul as that whose nature is knowledge. Thus according to Jainism the right view-point regards self as pure knower (*śuddha draṣṭā*) and distinct from not-self. This detached attitude only can free mankind from its mental as well as physical sufferings.

The Cause of Bondage and Suffering

First of all Jainism maintains that the attachment (*Rāga*) and delusion (*moha*) obscure our spiritual nature and are responsible for our worldly existence and suffering. The most intense *vāsanā* is *hṛdaya-granthi,* which is a deep attachment towards sense-objects and worldly desires. The oldest name of Jaina sect is *Niggantha-dhamma*. The word *Niggantha* means the one who has unknotted his *hṛdaya-granthi, i.e.,* the 'mine'-complex; it means, in other words, one who has eradicated ones attachment and passions. The word, 'Jaina', also conveys the same meaning; a true Jaina is one who has conquered ones passions. According to Lord Mahāvīra, "to remain attached to sensuous objects is to remain in the whirl (*Ācārāṅga,* 1.1.5). The attachment towards sensuous objects is the root of our worldly existence (*Ācārāṅga,* 1. 2.1). Further it is also mentioned in the *Ācārāṅga,* "only he who knows the nature of the sensuous objects is possessed of self, knowledge, scripture, Law (*dhamma*) and Truth (*bambha*)" (*Ācārāṅga,* 1.3.1). The five senses together with anger, pride, delusion and desire are difficult to be conquered, but when the self is conquered, all these are completely conquered (*Uttarādhyayana,* 9. 36). Just as the female crane is produced from the egg and

the egg from the crane, in the same way desire is produced by delusion and delusion by desire (*Uttarādhyayana,* 32.6). Attachment and hatred are the seeds of *karma,* which have delusion as their source. *Karma* is the root of birth and death. This cycle of birth and death is the sole cause of misery. Misery is gone in the case of a man who has no delusion, while delusion is gone in the case of a man who has no desire; desire is gone in the case of a man who has no greed, while greed is gone in the case of a man who has no attachment" (*Uttarādhyayana,* 32. 8). According to the *Tattvārtha-sūtra,* a famous Jaina text, perverse attitude (*mithyā-darśana*), non-abstinence (*avirati*), spiritual inertia (*pramāda*), passions (*kaṣāya*) and activity (*Yoga*) — these five are the conditions of bondage (8.1). We can say that *mithyā-darśana* (perverse attitude), *mithyā-jñāna* (perverse knowledge) and *mithyā-cāritra* (immoral conduct) are also responsible for our worldly existence or bondage. But perversity of knowledge and conduct depends upon the perversity of attitude. Thus the perversity of attitude, which is due to *darśana-moha* is one of the important factors of bondage. Non-absti- nence, spiritual inertia and passions are due to the presence of perverse attitude. Though activities of mind, body and speech are considered the cause of bondage, yet they are incapable of bondage unless they are followed by perverse attitude and passions. They are only the cause of *Āsrava* (influx of *kārmic* matter), not the cause of bondage. Bondage is possible only through these three types of activities or *yogas* in the presence of perverse attitude and passions. The perverse attitude (*mithyā- darśana*) and the passions (*Kaṣāyas*) are mutually cause and effect of each other just as the egg and the hen or the seed and the tree. We can not fix the priority of one over the other, passions are due to the perverse attitude and perverse attitude is due to the passions.

Process of Bondage

According to Jaina-philosophy every activity of mind, speech and body is followed by the influx of finer type of atoms, which are technically known as *karma-vargaṇā-pudgala*. In the presence of the passions this influx (*āsrava*) of *kārmic* matter cause bondage, which is of four types — 1. Kind (*prakṛti*), 2. quantity (*pradeśa*), 3. duration (*sthiti*) and 4. intensity (*anu-bhāga*) (*Tattvārthasūtra,* 8. 4). The activities of mind, body and speech, which are technically known as *yogas,* determine the *prakṛti* and the *pradeśa* of *kārmic*-matter and the passions determine the duration (*sthiti*) and the intensity (*anu- bhāga* – mild or intense power of fruition) of the *Karma*. The *Karma,* in Jainism is the binding principle, it binds the soul with the body and thus, it is responsible for our worldly existence. *Karma* has the same place in Jainism, as unseen potency (*adṛṣṭa*) does in Nyāya, *Prakṛti* in Sāṅkhya, *Māyā* in Vedānta, *Vāsanā* in Buddhism, *Śakti* in Śaivism and *Pāśa* (trap) in Śākta school. *Karma* is something foreign which veils the natural faculties of infinite knowledge, infinite perception, infinite bliss and infinite power of the soul. It is also responsible for our pleasant and unpleasant experiences and worldly existence. According to Vidyānandī there are two functions of the *Karma,* one is to obscure the natural faculties of soul and second is to corrupt the soul. Jainism also believes in the *modus operandi* of *karma*. According to it *karma* itself is competent to produce its fruit in due course of time and there is no need of God or other external power for its fruition.

The *Karmas* are of eight types — (i) *Jñānāvaraṇa*– knowledge obscuring, (ii) *Darśanāvaraṇa* – perception-obscuring, (iii) *Vedanīya* – feeling producing, (iv) *Mohanīya* – deluding, (v) *Āyu* – age determining, (vi) *Nāma* – body or personality determining, (vii) *Gotra* – status determining and

(viii) *Antarāya* – obstructive (*Tattvārthasūtra,* 8. 5).

Among these eight types of *karma, Jñānāvaraṇa, darśanāvaraṇa, mohanīya* and *antarāya* — these four are considered as destructive *karma* or *ghātī karma,* because they obscure the natural faculties of infinite knowledge, infinite perception, infinite bliss and infinite power respectively. The rest four —*vedanīya, āyu, nāma* and *gotra* are called *aghātī* or non-destructive *karma*. They are only responsible for bodily existence of present life and incapable of continuing the cycle of birth and death, it is only due to the deluding *karma* (*mohanīya karma*) that the cycle of birth and death continues. This deluding *karma* is responsible for perversity of attitude and the passions. The emancipation of soul is only possible when the perversity of attitude is destroyed and passions are overcome.

The *Uttarādhyayanasūtra* says that just as a tree with its root dried up, does not grow even though it is watered, similarly actions do not grow up when delusion (*moha* or *avidyā*) is destroyed (28. 30). One devoid of a right attitude (*darśana*) cannot have right knowledge (*jñāna*) and there cannot be rectitude of will (*caraṇa-guṇa*) without right knowledge (*jñāna*). One devoid of the rectitude of will cannot have emancipation from evil will, and one devoid of emancipation from evil will (induced by *karma*) cannot attain final emancipation (32. 9).

The Ultimate End : Mokṣa

The attainment of emancipation or *mukti* is the pivot on which all the ethico-religious philosophies of India revolve. Jainism maintains that the liberation – the perfect and purified state of the soul, is the only and ultimate goal of every individual. For it, *mukti* does not mean the losing one's own identity; the self retains its identity in the state of liberation also. In the *Niyamasāra* (181), 'Being' (*astitva*) is considered to be one of the qualities of a liberated soul .

Mokṣa, according to Jainism, means a complete perfection and purification of the soul. In the state of liberation there is neither pain nor pleasure, nor any obstruction, nor any annoyance, nor delusion, nor any anxiety. A liberated soul is really free from all sorts of impurities and from the cycle of birth and death (*Niyamasāra,* 178-180). In liberation the soul realises the *ananta-catuṣṭaya, i.e.,* infinite knowledge, infinite perception, infinite bliss and infinite power. This *ananta-catuṣṭaya* is the inherent nature of soul. Jainism believes that every individual soul has the potentialities of Godhood and the soul can attain it. By shedding away all the *karmic* particles of four destructive *karmas* (*ghātī-karma*), soul attains *Arhat*hood, which is the state of *vītarāga-daśā* or *jīvana-mukti*. As long as the four non-destructive *karmas, i.e., Nāma, Gotra, Āyuṣya and Vedanīya,* are not exhausted the soul of Lord *Arhat* remains in a highly refined physical body and preaches truth to the world. When these four non-destructive *karmas* are exhausted by shedding physical and *karmic* body, the soul of *Arhat* goes upto the top-most of the universe – abode of liberated soul (*siddhaśilā*), remains there eternally and enjoys perfect knowledge, perfect power, perfect perception and perfect bliss (*Niyamasāra,* 181-182). Thus emancipation according to Jainism is nothing but realisation of one's own real nature.

The Nature of Self

(a) Nature of Self as pure knower : Here naturally a question may arise, "What according to Jainism, is the nature of self ? While defining the nature of self, the *Ācārāṅga* mentions

Je āyā se vinnāya je vinnāya se āyā (1. 5. 5)

Self is the knower and the knower is the Self, thus the real nature of self is regarded as pure knower. Modern psychology recognizes three aspects of consciousness – cognitive, affective and conative. Among these three, the affective and

conative aspects respectively correspond to enjoying (experiencing) and to doing (behaving). So long as the self manifests itself as the enjoyer or the doer, it is not in its ideal state of pure knower, for, in this state, the mind constantly sways between 'either-or' or alternative feelings of pleasure and pain or alternative desires. Hence the mental equanimity of self is disturbed. But when consciousness appears as the pure Knower it can lead the self to a deep seated trance and free it from sufferings. A pure knower is not enamoured of the objects of pleasure which come to him. He enjoys them indifferently, and is therefore not subjected to attachment or bondage. It is mentioned in *Samayasāra* :

Jaha phaliyamaṇi suddho ṇa sayaṁ pariṇamadi rāgāmadihiṁ.
Rāijjadi aṇṇehiṁ du so rattādihiṁ davvehiṁ.
Evaṁ ṇāṇi suddho ṇa sayaṁ pariṇamadi rāgamadihiṁ.
Rāijjadi aṇṇehim du so rāgādihiṁ dosehiṁ. (300-301)

Just as the quartz crystal gem is by nature pure and white and it itself does not really become coloured in the presence of coloured objects but it appears to be coloured for it reflects the colour of the near object, similarly the pure knower does not modify itself into love etc. But by attachment and other defects it appears affected. Love, hatred and other thought activities are not the soul's own modifications. They are due to *Kārmic* matter. Really the soul is pure knower.

(b) Samatā as a Nature of Self : *Sāmāyika* (*samatā*) is the principal concept of Jainism. It is the pivot on which the ethics of Jainism revolves. In English, we can translate it as equality, equanimity, harmony, integration and rightness. But none of these terms conveys the complete meaning of the word *Samatā* (*Samāi* or *Samāhi*) in which it is used in Indian philosophy. And so it will be better to use it without translating into English. The word *Samatā* has different meanings in different

contexts. Sometimes it means a balanced state of mind which is undisturbed by any kind of sorrow, emotional excitement, pleasures, pains, achievements or disappointments. Sometimes it refers to the kind of personality which is completely free from the vectors of aversion and attachment, that is, a dispassionate personality with a mental equanimity. Ti word *Samatā* also means the feeling of equality with the fellow-beings. Loosely speaking, it also conveys the meaning of social equality and social integration. Ethically, the term *'Sama* or *Samyak'* means rightness. Inspite of all its different shades of meanings the term *samatā* is associated with some kind of a psychological state of mind and it has some impact on our external social and individual adjustments.

In a Jaina text known as *Bhagavatīsūtra,* there is a conversation between Lord Mahāvīra and Gautama. Gautama asked Mahāvīra – "What is the nature of soul" ? and Mahāvīra answered, "The nature of soul is equanimity." Gautama again asked, "What is the ultimate end of soul" ? and Mahāvīra replied, "The ultimate end of soul is also equanimity (*Viyāhapaṇṇatti,* 1. 9).

The view of Lord Mahāvīra that the real nature of soul is equanimity (*samatā*) is further supported by Ācārya Kundakunda. Kundakunda's famous work known as *Samayasāra,* in which Jaina spirituality reaches its culmination, deals with the nature of soul. In the whole of Jaina literature he is the only *ācārya* who used the word *'samaya'* or *'Samayasāra'* for soul (*Ātman*). I think the *Ācārya* has purposely used this word for *Ātman*. So far as I know, no commentator of *Samayasāra* has raised the question : "Why has Kundakunda used the word *'Samaya'* for *Jīva* or soul ?" I think the word *samaya* may be a Prākṛta version of Saṁskṛta-word *samah + yah* which means one who has the quality of equanimity, *i.e., Samatā*.

Further, the word *Samayasāra* can also be defined in the similar fashion. We can say that he who possesses *Samatā* as his essential nature is to be called *Samayasāra.*

Ācārya Kundakunda also equated the word *samaya* with *svabhāva* or essential nature. He used the words *sva-samaya* and *para-samaya*. *Sva-samaya* means real nature and *para-samaya* means resultant nature. Further, *sva-samaya, i.e.,* real nature, has been explained as an ultimate end. In this way according to Kundakunda also the real nature of soul as well as its ultimate end is equanimity or *samatā.*

Furthermore, according to the Jaina Ethics the way through which this ultimate end can be achieved is also *Samatā* which is known in Prākṛta as *samāhi* or *samāi*. In this way three basic presuppositions of Jaina Ethics, the moral agent, the ultimate end and the path through which this ultimate end can be achieved, are equated with the term equanimity or *samatā*. In Jaina Ethics ends and means do not exist as something external to the moral agent; they are part and parcel of his own real nature. By means of *sādhanā* we can actualize what is potentially present in us. According to the Jaina view equanimity (*samatā*) is our real potential nature and *sādhanā* is nothing but practice of equanimity. The three-fold path of right knowledge, right attitude or belief and right conduct solely depends on the concept of equanimity (*samatā*) for their rightness. The three- fold path is only an application of equanimity in the three aspects of our consciousness. According to Jainism, equanimity should be a directive principle of the activities of knowing, feeling and willing.

What is the justification for saying that our essential nature or our aim of life is *samatā* or that *samatā* should be the directive principle of our life and what are the grounds for its justification ? To answer these questions first of all we must

understand human nature. By human nature we mean man's organic and psychological make-up. What do we mean by a living organism ? What is the difference between a living and a non-living organism ? By living-organism we mean an organism that has the power to maintain its physiological equilibrium. In Biology this process is known as homoestasis, which is considered as an important quality of a living organism. The second essential quality of a living organism is its capacity for adjustment to its environment. Whenever a living organism fails to maintain its physiological equilibrium and to adjust itself to its environment, it tends towards death. Death is nothing but an utter failure of this process of maintaining equilibrium. Thus we can say that where there is life there are efforts to avoid unequilibrium and to maintain equilibrium.

Psychologically nobody wants to live in a state of mental tension. We like relaxation and not tension, satisfaction and not anxiety; this shows that our psychological nature working in us is for mental peace or mental equanimity. Freud accepts that there is a conflict between our Id and Super-ego but at the same time he agrees that our Ego or conscious level is always working to maintain equanimity or for the adjustment between these two poles of our personality, the ideal and the real. It is a fact that there are mental states such as emotional excitements, passions, anxieties and frustrations, but they do not form our essential nature because they do not exist for their own sake. Either they seek their satisfaction from some external objects or we want to get rid of these mental states. They are thus, the resultant expressions (vibhāva) of our self. An important process or our life is the process of adjustment, and at the mental level adjustment is nothing but a process of restoring mental peace, harmony and integration. In this way we can say that the Jaina concept of equanimity or *samatva* as the real

nature of soul has a sound ground for its justification in our organic and psychological nature also.

Darwin suggested that the "struggle for existence is the basic principle of living." Apparently it is true that there is a struggle for existence in our world and nobody can deny this fact. But owing to certain reasons we cannot call this a directive principle of living. First of all this theory is self-contradictory, because its basic slogan is 'live on others', in other words, it prescribs 'living by killing'. Secondly, it is opposed to the basic human nature and to even animal nature to a certain extent. The theory 'live on others' is against the simple rule that all living beings or human beings are potentially equal. The concept of equality of all living beings (*Samatā*) can only give us a right directive principle of living with fellow beings. The directive principle of living is not "live on others" but "live with others" or "live for others". The famous Jaina philosopher Umāsvāti in his *Tattvarthasūtra* maintains that the nature of *Jīva* is to serve one another (*Parasparopagraho jīvānām,* 5. 21). Struggle is not our inner nature but it is only a resultant nature, it is imposed on us by some outer factors. Whenever we have to struggle, we struggle under compulsion and whatsoever is done under compulsion cannot be a guiding principle of our living, because it does not blow out from inner nature. In the *Ācārāṅga* (1. 8. 3) also equanimity has been referred to as the essence of religion (*Dharma*). This equanimity or balanced state of mind is the real nature of self. According to Jainism, *Dharma* is nothing but the fundamental nature of a thing (*Vatthu sahāvo dhammo, Kārtikeyānuprekṣā;* 478). Jainism maintains that an ideal, which differs from one's own nature, cannot be realised or actualised; one's essential nature (*svalakṣaṇa*) alone can be our ideal.

It is true that dialectic materialism takes conflict or struggle as the law of life and states that the history of man is a

history of class-conflict, but this concept is erroneous. No conscious and living being tends to continue in a state of conflict, it rather seeks to put an end to a conflict as it arises. Since, struggle or conflict is something to be get rid of, it cannot be regarded as the real nature of soul. The main drive of life is towards putting an end to mental tensions (arising from external and internal stimuli) and returning to a state of mental equanimity. That is why Jainism maintains that equanimity is the real nature of self and calls it *Dharma*. It is also true that in Jainism the basic aim of religious aspirations is to put an end to such mental disequilibriums or tensions as attachment, desire, passion, hatred and others and to attain a detached and dispassionate state of consciousness. Attachment and the sense of mine beget attraction and repulsion and cause mental tension or disturb equanimity of mind. An attached man identifies not-self as self, whereas an unattached and dispassionate person regards self as self and not-self as not-self and thus maintains mental equanimity. 1360

According to Jainism the attainment of mental equanimity is the ultimate objective of man. It is in this state that consciousness can be free from constant flickerings and attain peace which again is a pre-condition for spiritual happiness which Jainism marks out as the goal of life and is possible alone in the state of equanimity. This comes down to the statement that the dispassionate stage of mind (*vītarāgatā*) or the equanimity of mind itself is alone the goal of life. This state of consciousness is also known as a state of pure knowership (*Sākṣībhāva* or *draṣṭābhāva*) which is the real nature of self and its attainment is the ultimate aim of life.

The Identity of Self with End and Means

In Jainism the aspirant, the end and the means are regarded as identical to self. Each member of the trinity is a manifes-

tation of self. The *Adhyātma-tattvāloka* (41. 7) mentions that self is both the binding network of the phenomenal universe (*saṁsāra*) and salvation from it. It remains in bondage so long as it is conditioned by the *Karmas* and under the domination of senses and passions, but when it has full control over them, it is emancipated. In his commentary on *Samayasāra* (305) Ācārya Amṛtacandrasūri says, "Emancipation (*Mukti*) consists in the exclusion of *para-dravya, i.e., Karma* and the realisation of one's own real nature. Ācārya Hemacandrasūri also maintains in his famous work *Yogaśāstra* (415), "The self which is conditioned and overwhelmed by the senses is in bondage and the self, which has control over them, is called the emancipated or the enlightened one. In fact, the self being yoked to desires constitutes bondage and when the desires are shed, the self appears in its pristine purity, it is emancipated. The Jaina view of the spiritual goal is that it is within the aspirant and not outside. What is realised by spiritual practices is not an external object, but the full manifestion of one's inner potentialities. Potentialities of self remain same at the beginning of the quest and at its end; the difference lies in the realisation or actualisation of these potentialities. Just as a seed is capable of being developed into a tree, and it actualises his capability when it is realy grown in the form of a tree, similarly the soul (*ātmā*) which has the potentiality of being the Supreme-Soul (*paramātmā*), becomes perfect by realising its potentialities of infinite knowledge, infinite perception, infinite bliss and infinite power. According to Jainism salvation lies in the full developement of our potentialities. The mission of Jainism is the realisation of the self through the self. The godhood which is already present in the self has to be manifested and the soul has to be brought to its purity. Thus the spiritual journey of soul starts from impure state of the soul and ends with the pure state of the soul (*Śuddhātmā*).

From the Jaina view-point the path of liberation is also not different from the self. The three aspects of our consciousness – cognition, affection and conation, when rightly oriented constitute the path of emancipation. In the Jaina philosophy, the three-fold path of liberation consists of right knowledge (*samyak-jñāna*), right belief (*samyak-darśana*) and right conduct (*samyak-cāritra*). This implies that the cognitive, affective and conative wings of the self, processed into right knowledge, right belief and right conduct, appear to be the real path. Thus considered, the path of emancipation is also soul-stuff. As Ācārya Kundakunda puts it :

Ādā khu majjhaṇāṇaṁ ādā me daṁsaṇaṁ carittaṁ ca
Ādā paccakkhāṇaṁ ādā me saṁvaro jogo.
Daṁsaṇaṇāṇa carittāṇi sevidavvāṇi sāhuṇā ṇiccaṁ.
Tāṇi puṇa jāṇa tiṇṇivi appāṇaṁ ceva ṇicchayado.

Samayasāra, 18. 19

Right knowledge (*Jñāna*), right faith (*Darśana*), renunciation (*Pratyākhyāna*), discipline (*Saṁvara*) and *Yoga* are the means to realize the real nature of the self. The same self (soul) is in knowledge, perception, renunciation, discipline and *Yoga*. What appears as knowledge, faith and conduct is no other than the self. From practical view-point (*Vyavahāranaya*) they are said to be different from the self, but from real view-point (*niścaya-naya*) they are one and same with self. Right faith, knowledge and conduct should always be pursued by a saint, but he must know that all these three from real view-point are the self itself.

●

Chapter IV

The Path of Liberation

Jainism prescribes three-fold path for the attainment of liberation. In the *Tattvārthasūtra* (1. 1), right belief, right knowledge and right conduct have been said to be the path of liberation. In the *Uttarādhyayanasūtra* (28. 2) and in the works of Kundakunda (*Sīlapāhuḍa,* 10) right penance is also mentioned as one of its constitutes and thus they prescribed a four-fold path. But the later Jaina thinkers include right penance in right conduct and thus recognise the three-fold path of liberation.

Like Jainism, Buddhism also prescribes a three-fold path of liberation. In Buddhism these three constituents are *Śīla* (conduct), *Samādhi* (balanced state of mind) and *Prajñā* (knowledge). In Hinduism also we find *Jñānayoga, Karmayoga and Bhakti-yoga*. In a particular context the *Gītā* also refers to *Prāṇipāta* (self-submission), *Pariprasna* (enquiry) and *Sevā* (service) as the three approaches to salvation. These respectively represent devotion, knowledge and action.

Some Indian thinkers hold that the cultivation of only one of these constituents of the path of liberation is sufficient for an aspirant to attain liberation. But the Jaina philosophers do not agree with them in this respect. According to them simultaneous cultivation of faith, knowledge and conduct alone can lead to liberation. Absence of any one of these constituents makes emancipation impossible. The *Uttarādhyayanasūtra* mentions :

Nādaṁsaṇissa ṇāṇaṁ, ṇāṇeṇa viṇā na hunti caraṇaguṇā.
Aguṇissa ṇatthi mokkho, ṇatthi amokkhassa nivvāṇaṁ. (28. 30)

Knowledge is impossible without a right view-point or faith and without right knowledge, right conduct is not possible and without right conduct, liberation remains unattainable. Thus all the three are needed for the attainment of emancipation.

Right View-point or Right Faith

In Jaina scriptures the word *'darśana'* has been used in different senses and scholars of Jainism differ widely on its actual meaning. For some thinkers *'darśana'* is *prajñā* or intuition, as distinct from knowledge which is rational inference. *Darśana* is also construed as self realisation. In ancient Jaina scriptures the word *daṁsaṇa* or *darśana* has been used in the sense of philosophy, an outlook about the ultimate reality, the world and the self. This is called *diṭṭhi* or *dṛṣṭi*. In the *Uttarādhyayanasūtra* and *Tattvārthasūtra, darśana* has been used in the sense of faith or belief in *Tattvas*, *i.e.*, metaphysical principles. In the later Jaina literature the word *darśana* stands for devotion to the *Tīrthaṅkara* (*deva*), preceptors (*guru*) and religion (*dharma*). Thus in the Jaina tradition right view-point (*samyak-darśana*) has a wide connotation ranging from self realisation, intuition, vision, view-point, faith for metaphysical principles to devotion. Whether *samyak-darśana* is called right (unbiased) view-point or faith in metaphysical principles or devotion, theoretically it makes no difference.

The difference lies in the methods of its realisation. A scientist brings out a truth on the basis of his experiments but the common man gets the same truth by taking for granted the statements of that scientist in whose authority he has an unshaken faith. Indeed both of them know the truth; one has attained it through his own realisation, the other through his faith in the authority of the former. Even if devotion to the *Tīrthaṅkaras* is regarded as *samyak-darśana* it is not the real *samyak-darśana* for *samyak-darśana* is the devotion to our

own pure self. Right view-point or right faith is a calm and undisturbed state of mind in which the pure self (*śuddhātmā*) is realised. It is a vision of pure self. In Jainism right faith has been discussed from two points of view – the real and the practical. The practical right faith is a true and firm devotion to the *deva,* the *guru,* the *dharma* and the *śāstra,* while the real right faith is a firm belief in the true and pure nature of the soul. Though the concepts of faith and devotion are present in Jainism, but Jainism does not believe that the divine grace is essential for the attainment of liberation. According to Jainism the soul itself is the architect of its own destiny, the Jaina religion is the religion of self-help, which is unique in the history of world-religions. However, the Jainas believe that true devotion to the *Tīrthaṅkaras* yields fruitful results for an aspirant. Though the *Tīrthaṅkaras* are the object of our worship, yet they do not help directly to an aspirant, except that an aspirant can realise his own real nature through contemplation on their nature, because inherently he possesses the same nature as they have. A Gujarati Jaina poet has expressed this idea in the following verse :

Ajakulagat keśerī, lahere nijapadasimha nihāla;
Tim prabhu bhakti bhavi lahere, nijātama sambhala.

Just as a cub brought out in herd of sheep realises his real nature as a lion after seeing a lion, so also an aspirant realises his own real nature as *Arhat* by worshipping the *Arhat*.

Five Constituents of Right Faith : In Jainism the following have been stated as the five constituents of right faith —

(i) *Sama* : equanimity or balanced state of mind

(ii) *Saṁvega* : the realisation of blissful nature of self or yearning for truth,

(iii) *Nirveda* : unattachment or indifference,

(iv) *Anukampā* : to realise others sufferings as one's own and to be sympathetic to them and

(v) *Astikāya* : firm belief in *Puṇya* and *Pāpa,* virtue and vice, re-birth, doctrine of *Karma* and the existence of soul.

Six Places of Right Faith : In Jainism right faith (*Samyak-darśana*) consists in the recognition of six facts —

(i) the soul exists,

(ii) the soul is eternal,

(iii) the soul is the doer of its deeds,

(iv) the soul is the enjoyer of the good or bad fruits of its deeds,

(v) the soul can attain liberation and

(vi) there is a way to liberation.

According to Jaina thinkers a firm conviction of these six principles is essential for the cultivation of right faith. The rightness of knowledge as well as conduct depends on the acceptance of these six principles which have pivotal position in Jaina religious ethics.

Eight Limbs of Right Faith : The *Uttarādhyayana* (28.31) and many other Jaina texts mention the eight limbs of right faith (*Samyak-darśana*).

(i) *Nihaśaṅkita* : This quality is negatively explained as an absence of all sorts of doubt and positively as an unshaken belief in the Jaina doctrines.

(ii) *Nihkāṅkṣita* : It is explained as an absence of desire for worldly pleasures. A right believer should not hanker after worldly pleasures and material gains. Amṛtacandrasūri defined it also as an avoidence of one sided viewer's wrong beliefs (*Mithyā-darśana*). A right believer should not cling to one-sided views of other faiths (*Puruṣārtha-siddhyupāya,* 24).

(iii) *Nirvicikitsā* : It means that one who possesses right belief should not exhibit a feeling of disgust to the self-absorbed monks, who are not very particular about their bodily

cleanliness. For a right believer anything of this material world is neither pleasant nor unpleasant, neither beautiful nor ugly, rather, he looks at every thing with a dispassionate attitude.

(iv) *Amūḍhadṛṣṭi* : *Amūḍhadṛṣṭi* means a clear and right understanding about the nature of religion and the ideal of life. A person possessing right belief should not cling to superstitions pertaining to gods, preceptor (*guru*) and religious practices. One should not believe in psuedo-scriptures, plausible theories, psuedo-*guru* and psuedo-deities.

(v) *Upabṛhaṇa* : It means cultivation of one's spiritual qualities. This is also named as *upagūhana* which means concealing demerits of the others and merits of one's own.

(vi) *Sthirīkaraṇa* : It means that one should make them firm in the faith, who deviate from righteousness under the influence of anger, pride, sex and other passions.

(vii) *Vātsalya* : It means selfless love for our fellow beings. It also means the cultivation of the sense of brotherhood towards the followers of right faith.

(viii) *Prabhāvanā* : It means that one should work for the propagation of right faith by means of charity, austerity and such other means as are suitable to the time and place and should preach the truth to others.

Five Blemishes of Right Faith : The *Upāsakadasāṅga* (1. 44) as well as *Tattvārthasūtra* (7. 18) mention the following five blemishes (*aticāra*) of right faith —.

(i) Doubt or a sceptic view about the teaching of Jainas.

(ii) Desire for worldly pleasures.

(iii) Repulsion or a feeling of disgust.

(iv) Acceptence of false views or creeds.

(v) Praise of the followers of false creeds.

Right Knowledge

The rightness of knowledge depends upon the right-

ness of attitude or view-point. Right knowledge has been regarded as one of the means to liberation. In Jainism right knowledge has been defined in various ways. Generally speaking, right knowledge is the knowledge of seven principles — *jīva* (living substance), *ajīva* (non-living substance), *āsrava* (influx of *kārmic* matter), *saṁvara* (stoppage of the influx of *kārmic* matter), *bandha* (bondage), *nirjarā* (shedding of the accumulated *karmic* matter) and *mokṣa* (liberation). It consists in knowing the things in all their infinite facets. According to Jaina philosophy, one-sided knowledge or a biased view-point is false as it ignores the infinite aspects of things. So long as one has one-sided view (*ekāntika dṛṣṭi*) or a biased view (*āgraha*) right knowledge is not possible. In the absence of an integral-view right knowledge is out of the question. Thus, unbiased attitude is also the pre-condition of right knowledge. In order to know the infinite aspects of reality, a many pronged approach is a *sine-qua non* of right knowledge. The one-sided view-point or a biased enquiry tinges the truth. Hence one-sidedness, extremism and biasness hinder the realisation of truth. The Jaina philosophy enjoins that personal prejudices must be discarded and an impartial attitude should be cultivated. Only the integral and synthetic approach can give us a full vision of reality, which is the right knowledge. Right knowledge is the knowledge of a thing in all its infinite facets and it is possible only through gestalt view (*samagra-dṛṣṭi*).

Alternatively, Jainism also holds that right knowledge consists in discrimination between self and not-self. It is true that the self, the knower, cannot be made the object of knowledge. It is not possible to know the self on the basis of knower-known relationship. The self is the knower and the knower can never become an object of knowledge. This makes knowledge of self unique. But the knowledge of not-self is possible through

knower-known relationship. Even an ordinary man can know through his common-sense that whatsoever is the object of his knowledge, is not his self, but not-self. Right knowledge is the knowledge of self and self can be known only with reference to not-self. Knowing the nature of not-self and differentiating it from self is the science of discrimination (*bheḍa-vijñāna*) and this constitutes the essential meaning of right knowledge in the Jaina Philosophy.

Ācārya Kundakunda has made an exhaustive study of the science of discrimination (*Bheda-vijñāna*) in his book *Samayasāra* (207, 210), he says

Puggala kammaṁ koho tassa vivāgodao havadi eso..
ṇa hu es a majjhabhāvo jāṇagabhāvo du ahamikko.
udayavivāgo viviho kammāṇaṁ vaṇṇido jiṇavaraehiṁ
ṇa du te majjha ṣahāvā jāṇaga bhāvo du ahamikko.

Anger etc. are due to the power of fruition of the *karmic* matter and thus, they are not the real nature of self. The self is only knower; Jainas have explained various kinds of fruition and these operation of *karmas* are not the real nature of self. The self is the pure knower. Ācārya Amṛtacandrasūri says : he, who is liberated (*siddha*), has become so, through discrimination of self from not-self and he who is in bondage is so due to its absence (*Samayasāra Kalaśa,* 132). In *Iṣṭopadeśa* (33) it is mentioned that a right knowledge is that in which a clear distinction between the self and the not-self is made.

Thus in Jainism, from the practical point of view, right knowledge is the knowledge of the seven principles, namely *Jīva, Ajīva, Āsrava, Samvara, Bandha, Nirjarā* and *Mokṣa*. But from the real point of view right knowledge is the knowledge of the real and the true nature of the self as quite distinct from the not-self. It is a discriminative knowledge between the self and not-self. The right knowledge means the knowledge of our own

inherent nature; in other words, it is the knowledge of *sasvabhāva*. Thus, in Jainism the right knowledge does not mean mere academic and objective knowledge of the scriptures or the seven principles (*tattvas*), but it is the subjective experience of our own self with its inherent Godliness. The right knowledge is an awakened state of our pure consciousness (*apramattadaśā*). It is the state of pure knowership (*sakṣibhāva*).

According to Jaina philosophy right knowledge is of five types :

1. Matijñāna

The knowledge, obtained through five senses and the mind (*manas*), is called *matijñāna*. It includes both sense-perception as well as the rational and inferential knowledge.

2. Śrutajñāna

The knowledge acquired through language or through symbolic expressions is called *śrutajñāna*. In this type of knowledge, the Jainas include the knowledge gained through the study of scriptures. It is also called scriptural knowledge.

The above two types of knowledge, as they are not directly obtained by the soul, are called *parokṣa-jñāna,* by the early Jaina philosophers. They depend either on the sense organs or on the scriptures. The following three types of knowledge are included in *pratyakṣa-jñāna, i.e.,* direct knowledge. They are —

3. Avadhijñāna

It is an extra-ordinary perception, akin to clairvoyance. It is regarded as extra-sensory perception. It is obtained by human beings through penances or yogic practices, but in the kingdoms of heaven and hell it is innate. It is confined to material world only as its objects.

4. Manaḥparyayajñāna

It means the reading of thought-waves. It is the know-

ledge of thought-activity or mental modes of the other beings. According to Jaina philosophy, mind is made up of *mano-vargaṇā-pudgala, i.e.,* finer type of atoms, and every mode of thought is reflected in the mind-substance (*mano-dravya*). *Manaḥ-paryayajñāna* is a direct experience of such modes of mind-substance working in other individual's minds. It is akin to the modern concept of telepathy. It is obtained when soul is extraordinarily purified through a high order of conduct and only the human beings can obtain it.

5. Kevalajñāna

It is the perfect knowledge. It is also known as omniscience, because it intuits all the substances with all their modes of the past, present and future. When the veil of four destructive *karma* is completely removed, omniscience dawns. In omniscience there is nothing to be known and nothing remains unknown. But Ācārya Kundakunda gives some what different interpretation of *Kevalajñāna*. He says it is only from the practical view that the *Kevalī* knows all the substances with all their modes; from the real point of view the *kevalī* knows his ownself (*Niyama-sāra,* 158). Thus, the *Kevalajñāna* is the Knowledge of one's own self.

Among the above mentioned five types of knowledge the first three may be right or may be wrong. Their rightness or wrongness depends on the rightness or wrongness of the attitude, vision or faith of the knower; but the last two are exclusively modes of right knowledge. In *Mūlācāra* (5. 70-71) Ācārya Vattakera has laid down some criteria for determining the rightness or wrongness of knowledge. He says —

Jeṇa taccaṁ vibujjhejja jeṇa cittaṁ nirujjhadi
Jeṇa attā visujjhejja taṁ ṇāṇaṁ jiṇasāsaṇe.
Jeṇa rāga virajjejja jeṇa seesu rajjadi
Jeṇa mitti pabhavejja taṁ ṇāṇaṁ jiṇasāsaṇe.

In Jainism the (right) knowledge is that which helps to understand the reality, controls the mind and purifies the soul. It is through the (right) knowledge that the ties of attachment are severed, interest in the ultimate goal is developed and the feelings of universal friendship are strengthened.

Relationship between Right faith, Right knowledge and Right Conduct : Among the Jaina thinkers there is no controversy about the order of these three constituents of the path of liberation. The priority of view-point over knowledge and conduct is generally accepted. The Jaina scriptures point out that right-conduct and right-knowledge are impossible in the absence of right- view-point. Ācārya Kundakunda mentions –

Sammattavirahiyā naṁ, sutthu vi uggaṁ tavaṁ carantāṇaṁ
Ṇa lahanti bohilahaṁ, avi vāsasahassakodihiṁ.
Daṁsaṇabhatthā bhatthā, daṁsaṇabhatthassa ṇatthi ṇivvāṇaṁ.
Sijjhanti cariyabhatthā, daṁsaṇabhattha ṇa sijjhanti.

(*Daṁsaṇapāhuḍa,* 5. 3)

Those persons who are devoid of right faith will not obtain right knowledge, even if they practise severe penance for a thousand crores of years.

Those who have fallen from right faith are deprived of liberation.Those who have fallen from right conduct may attain liberation but those who have fallen from right faith have no chance.

Ācārya Bhadrabāhu in *Ācārāṅga Niryukti* (221) also presents the same view. He says that in the penance, knowledge and action attain their fruition through right attitude.

We must also remember that this priority of attitude or faith (*darśana*) is not an exclusive one, to cultivate right view-point for supression or elimination of extreme type of passions, technically known as *'anantānubandhī kaṣāya'* is essential; thus

right conduct proceeds from right attitude and right attitude proceeds from right conduct. Mahāvīra has instructed a course of discipline in which the co-existence of action with knowledge and faith is indispensable. Though priority of right knowledge over right conduct is accepted, it cannot lead to liberation unless it is followed by right conduct. The *Sūtrakṛtāṅga* (2/1/3) reveals, "whether a man is a Brahmin or a *bhikṣu* or a knower of many scriptures, he would suffer on account of his actions, if they are not good. It is also said in the *Uttarādhyayanasūtra* (6. 11) that knowledge of various languages and many scriptures have no enriching effect on self. Those who are adicted to vice and regard themselves as learned are really ignorant. They offer only verbal satisfaction to their souls. In the *Āvaśyaka-niryukti* (9. 11) Ācārya Bhadrabāhu says, Even the knower of many scriptures cannot cross the ocean of the world (*Saṁsāra*) if his actions are not good. In bringing out the mutual relationship of knowledge and action on the basis of 'blind-lame simile' (*Andha-paṅgu-Nyāya*), the Ācārya further says, "Just as a chariot on one wheel cannot move, and a blind or a lame cannot reach the destination by himself, in the same way mere knowledge or mere action cannot lead one to liberation. It is attainable only through the presence of both."

Right Conduct

After dealing with right faith and right knowledge we shall now discuss right conduct. In Jainism right conduct has been explained from two angles. From the real point of view, right conduct is a state in which soul is completely free from passions and perversities. It is the state of self awareness and self absorption. In this state self enjoys his own very nature and remains undisturbed from the external motivations. It is the state of equanimity of mind which is known in Jainism as *sāmāyika* or *samiti*. Ācārya Kundakunda in *Pravacana-sāra* (1. 7) says :

"Conduct is *dharma, dharma* is equanimity and equanimity means that state of self which is free from delusion and mental tension. From the practical point of view right conduct means the adoption of such rules of discipline as prescribed in *Āgamas*."

Every conduct or action has two aspects : (i) extrinsic and (ii) intrinsic, which are traditionally called as *dravya* and *bhāva* respectively. In Jainism external rightness of an action is to be decided in relation with the others. In other words, external rightness of an action depends upon its outer social results. If an action results in the wellbeing of others or cultivates social good from the practical or extrinsic view-point it is called good or right. But the intrinsic purity or righteousness of an action depe- nds on the intention or motive of the doer. It is the purity of intention or motive, not the external results, that makes an action intrinsically good or bad. Ācārya Kundakunda mentions :

Maradu vā jīvadu vā jīvo, ayadācarassa nicchidā hiṁsā.
Payadassa ṇatthi bandho, hiṁsāmetteṇa samidassa.

(*Pravacana-sāra,* 3. 17)

A person behaving carelessly with a passionate mind incurs the sin of causing injury, whether actual injury results or not; but on the other hand there will be no bondage of sin to one who is impassionate and firm in the observance of carefulness (*Samiti*), even if injury results by his conduct (because there is mental purity). Prof. J. N. Sinha also rightly puts the Jaina-view in his famous book *Indian Philosophy.* He says : the Jaina ethics emphasises purity of motive as distinguished from consequences of actions. It considers an action to be right if it is actuated by a good intension (*abhisandhi*), thought it leads to unhappiness of others. It considers an action to be wrong if it is actuated by a bad intention though it leads to happiness of others. An intention is pure, when it is devoid of attachment, aversion, delusion and passions. It is impure when it is distre-

ssing and agressive. Righteousness depends on purity of motive or intention and not on external consequences (Vol. I, p. 264). Being an integral philosophy, Jainism does give due consideration to the consequences of an action. From the practical view point, it should be born in mind that the external aspect of morality should not be neglected. It adds due importance to the practical and social aspect of morality. According to the Jaina philosophers the purity or righteousness of thought should be followed by right action. They do not believe in the dualism of thought and action. For them a right action is the proof of mental purity. That is why they have prescribed a code of conduct for house-holders as well as for the monks.

Chapter V

Code of Conduct for House-holders

According to the Digambara sect, refraining from taking meat, wine, honey and five kinds of figs are the fundamental restraint prescribed for a Jaina-layman. In lieu of these eight *mūlaguṇas,* Śvetāmbaras prescribe the avoidence of the seven bad deeds, namely gambling, meat-eating, consuming alcohol (wine), adultery, hunting, stealing and debauchery. Hemacandra in his *Yoga-śāstra* has mentioned 35 qualities of a Jaina house-holder in ten verses. Here we are giving their English rendering*.

1. He who gains his livelihood by honesty and admires as well as and follows excellence of conduct and marries his sons and daughters to well-born and well-behaved family.

2. He is afraid of committing sins, he follows the customs of his country, never speaks evil of any one and especially not of his ruler.

3. He lives in neither too secluded nor too open a residence. It must be situated in a good locality and have good neighbours. The house must not have too many entrances.

4. He always associates with good men, worships his parents and abandons an unprotected place of evil reputation.

5. He regulates his expenditure according to his income, dresses according to his position and being endowed with eight kinds of intelligence hears religious discourses every day.

6. If he suffers from indigestion, he ought not to eat.

---

* The author is thankful to Mrs. Stevensen for this English rendering. It has been taken from her book "The Heart of Jainism".

He eats only at fixed times. He should gain his ends (*puruṣārthas*) in such a way that the one does not interfere with the other.

7. He gives alms to those who come unexpectedly, to the *Sādhu* and to the poor, is free from obstinacy and has a partiality for good qualities.

8. Knowing his own strength and weakness, he avoids such actions as are not suited to the time and country (in which he lives). He worships persons who are rigid in keeping their vows and far advanced in knowledge and he feeds those who deserve feeding.

9. He is provident, has more than ordinary knowledge, is grateful for what is done for him, is loved by people, is modest, merciful, of a serene disposition and benevolent.

10. He is always intent on defeating the six interior enemies and controls all his five-senses. Such are the suggestions of a house-holder's duties.

Twelve Vows

Practical right conduct of a house-holder consists in observing the following twelve vows :

(i) *Ahimsā :* refraining from intentionally killing and doing injury of all types of mobile living beings.

(ii) *Satya :* refraining from falsehood.

(iii) *Asteya :* refraining from theft.

(iv) *Brahmacarya :* refraining from sexual relations except with one's own wife and to remain contended with one's own wife.

(v) *Parigraha parimāṇa :* limiting one's possessions.

(vi) *Dig-vrata :* limiting the field of one's worldly activities in all the ten directions.

(vii) *Bhogopabhoga parimāṇa :* Limiting one's enjoyment of consumable items like food etc. and non-consumable items like clothes etc.

(viii) *Anarthadaṇḍa viramaṇa :* Taking a vow not to induldge in purposeless, bad activities.

(ix) *Sāmāyika :* To practise mental equanimity.

(x) *Deśavrata :* To refrain oneself from worldly activities for a fixed period of time.

(xi) *Proṣadhopavāsa :* Observing fast once a week.

(xii) *Atithi-Samvibhāga :* Offering food etc. to the monks and the needy persons.

When the house-holder takes these vows he has to know the acts which defile his vow so that he can avoid them. Any intentional violation of the rules of the vow is defilement of the vow. A house-holder should be aware of the following transgressions or violations (*aticāra*) of these twelve vows.

(1) Five major violations pertaining to Non-violence

(a) Tying up living beings tightly.

(b) Hitting them with sticks or by any other means.

(c) Piercing or amputating any organ of the body.

(d) Making them carry heavy load.

(e) Withholding their food and drink.

(2) Five major violations pertaining to the vow of truthfulness

(a) Sudden calumniation or saying any thing without pre-consideration.

(b) Disclosing secrets of others.

(c) Divulging the confidence of one's wife.

(d) Misleading the others and

(e) Preparing false documents.

(3) Five major violations pertaining to the vow of Non-stealing

(a) Abetment of theft or to encourage some one to commit theft.

(b) Receiving or purchasing stolen property.

(c) Violating the rules of the state.

(d) Improper measuring and inaccurate weighing.

(e) Dealing in adulteration and counterfeit.

(4) Five major violations pertaining to the vow of Celibacy

(a) Having pre-marital and extra marital sexual relation.

(b) Having sexual relation with prostitutes or keeping some one for the time being for sexual enjoyment.

(c) Having perverse or unnatural sexual relation and using unnatural means for sexual satisfaction.

(d) Getting others involved into sensual pleasure or to arrange someone else's marriage.

(e) Being obessive towards sensual activities.

(5) Five major violations pertaining to the vow of Non-possession or limitation on accumulations

(a) Accumulating more open land or a bigger house than one's self-prescribed limits.

(b) Accumulating too much gold, silver, precious jewelry, etc. beyond one's accepted limits.

(c) Holding too much crop or coin beyond one's accepted limits.

(d) Arranging for unnecessary servents and cattles.

(e) Accumulating too much housewares and equipments.

(6) Five major violations pertaining to Digvrata (Geographic limitations)

(a) Crossing the accepted limits of upward direction.

(b) Crossing the accepted limits of downward direction.

(c) Crossing the accepted limits of transverse direction – Eastern, Western, Northern or Southern.

(d) Extending the limits of freedom of movement.

(e) Not to keep in memory a regulation prescribed or transgressing the limits through forgetfulness.

(7) Five major violations pertaining to limitation on consumption of goods and occupations

(a) Consuming such things which possesses life, *i.e.*, unripe or uncooked fruits and grains.

(b) Consuming non-living things which are contaminated with living things such as ripe fruit with seeds.

(c) Consuming uneatables or the things which cause intoxication.

(d) Consuming something that is not cooked properly.

(e) Consuming something in which there is less to eat and more to discard.

Inspite of these five violations pertaining to food there are fifteen more violations pertaining to occupation.

(a) Occupation in which furnaces are used and thus polution is created in air through smoke and gases.

(b) Occupations in which trees are cut down.

(c) Occupations related to fermented goods such as liquor.

(d) Occupation of renting animals or carts pulled by animals which ultimately causes cruelity towards animal.

(e) Occupations involving explosions.

(f) Trades in ivory, bones, horns, etc.

(g) Occupations concerned with crushing etc.

(h) Trades in lard or fat.

(i) Trades in sealing wax, etc.

(j) Trades in poisonous and toxic substances, such as, opium and pesticides, etc.

(k) Occupations in which animals, birds, fishes etc. are tortured or killed.

(l) Occupations in which animals, birds are amputated.

(m) Occupations in which fires are set in forests, fields, etc.

(n) Occupations in which lakes, ponds, etc. are dried up.

(o) Occupations in which wicked men, prostitutes or call girls are supported.

(8) Five major violations pertaining to the vow of abstaining purposeless misconduct

(a) Licentious speech or uttering words that would arouse passions.

(b) Vulgar bodily gestures.

(c) Obscene talks or jargons.

(d) Supplying poison and weapons or other such objects as may lead to violence.

(e) Possessing in excess the things of daily requirement.

(9) Five Major violations pertaining to the vow of self control.

(a) Misconduct of speech.

(b) Misconduct of body.

(c) Misconduct of mind.

(d) Lack of Interest in *sāmāyika* or a feeling of disregard in practicing equanimity.

(e) Lack of requisit memory in practicing equanimity.

(10) Five major violations pertaining to the vow of day to day additional limits (*Deśavrata*)

(a) Asking somebody to bring something from beyond the set limits.

(b) Sending some one for something beyond the set limits.

(c) Making some sound and giving hints to those who are outside the limits to do certain jobs.

(d) To make bodily gesture for the same purpose.

(e) To throw some physical stuff outside the set limits for indicating one's purpose.

(11) Five major violations pertaining to the vow of practicing the life of a monk (*Poṣadha Vrata*)

(a) To evacuate, urinate etc., at a place not properly inspected and cleansed of insects etc.

(b) Similar care should be taken while picking up or laying down any object like a stick, pot, etc.

(c) To arrange bedding without taking care of living beings.

(d) Lack of zeal in performing the necessary duties.

(e) Forgetfulness about the observance of *Poṣadha vrata*.

(12) Five major violations pertaining to the vow of sharing with guests and others (*Atithisamvibhāga vrata*)

(a) Placing something sentient while offering food to the monks.

(b) Covering of food with a sentint thing like a leaf with an intention to avoid offering of alms.

(c) Offering of food to the monks at in-appropriate time with an intention of avoiding alms giving, or asking a monk to accept food at such time when he is not allowed to take food.

(d) Saying that the objects of alms desired do not belong to the host.

(e) Lack of respect and veneration for monk.

Essential Daily Duties

Along with these twelve vows, every Jaina house-holder is ordinarily required to perform the following six daily duties :

1. *Deva-pūjā* — Worship of the *Arhats,* the adorables.

2. *Guru-Bhakti* — Devotion to the *gurus* or preceptor-saints.

3. *Svādhyaya* — Study of the scriptures.

4. *Saṁyama* — Control of the five senses and the mind.

In practising *saṁyama,* it is necessary to renounce certain objects of enjoyments.

5. *Tapa* or austerities such as meditating upon the nature of soul, every morning and evening, for a fixed period of time.

6. *Dāna* or Charity — Giving : (a) food, (b) knowledge, (c) medicine and (d) protection to other beings.

In the Śvetāmbara texts we have these six essential duties in a different way. They are the same as are prescribed for the monks.

Eleven stages of spiritual progress of a house-holder

(1) *Darśana-pratimā* — Having a firm faith in the doctrines of Jainas.

(2) *Vrata-pratimā* — Observance of the twelve vows of a house-holder.

(3) *Sāmāyika-pratimā* — To practise for the equanimity of mind and observance of complete non-violence, thrice a day at least for about 48 minutes duration.

(4) *Proṣadhopavāsa-pratimā* — To observe fast on the 8th & the 14th day of every fortnight and to keep oneself engaged in contemplation.

(5) *Sacitta-tyāga-pratimā* — Refraining from taking animate water and vegetables.

(6) *Rātri-bhukti-tyāga-pratimā* — Refraining from taking food and water in the night.

(7) *Brahmacarya-pratimā* — Observance of complete continence.

(8) *Arambha-tyāga-pratimā* — To give up all worldly occupations.

(9) *Parigraha-tyāga-pratimā* — Renouncement of worldly possessions or property.

(10) *Anumati-tyāga-pratimā* — Not to offer advice on any worldly matter.

(11) *Uddiṣṭa-tyāga-pratimā* — Not to take that food which is prepared specially for him.

●

Chapter VI

Code of Conduct for a Jaina Monk

According to Jaina religion practical right conduct for a monk or a nun consists in observing the following rules :

(a) Six great vows

1. The monks and the nuns should not kill or injure any living being, whether it is mobile or immobile.

2. They should not tell a lie in any case.

3. They should not take anything which is not given to them by its owner.

4. The monks and the nuns must observe complete celibacy and should not have any connection with the opposite sex. They must abstain not only from sexual intercourse but also from bodily decoration, sense indulgence, exciting food, association with other sex, exciting surrounding and passionate thinking.

5. The monks and the nuns should not have any possession or *parigraha* except such objects as are allowed by the scriptures and are essential for the observance of *saṁyama* and non-violence but they should not have any desire for or attachment to such objects.

6. They should take their meal only once a day and before sunset. Eating in the night is strictly prohibited.

(b) Five Types of Vigilance

1. They should move always looking forward on the ground and in the day-time only. They should travel only on that path which is free from living creatures and green vegetables.

2. They must avoid superfluous and harsh speech and backbiting. They should speak politely.

3. They should take only that food which is neither prepared for them, nor suggested by them. They should avoid over-eating and eating for the sake of taste. While begging they should keep the convenience of the house-holder in view.

4. They must be careful in lifting and putting their articles to avoid injury to living beings.

5. They should observe careful evacuation of excretions.

(c) Three Guptis

They should have proper control on their activities of mind, body and speech.

(d) Control of Five Senses

They should have proper control on their five senses.

(e) Ten Cardinal Virtues

The monks and the nuns should cultivate the following ten cardinal virtues :

(i) Forgiveness, (ii) Humility, (iii) Straight-forwardness, (iv) Purity, (v) Truthfullness, (vi) Self restraint, (vii) Austerity, (viii) Renunciation, (ix) Detachment and (x) Continence.

(f) Six Essentials (Ṣaḍāvaśyaka)

1. *Sāmāyika* – They should practise mental equanimity and try to get rid of impure thought – activity.

2. *Stavana* – They should praise the *Tīrthaṅkara*.

3. *Vandanā* – They should pay salutation to the elderly monks and the preceptors.

4. *Pratikramaṇa* – Repentance.

5. *Pratyākhyāna* – Renunciation.

6. *Kayotsarga* – Non-attachement for body.

(g) Twelve Austerities

The monks and the nuns should observe the following twelve austerities :

(i) Fasting, (ii) Eating less than one's normal diet, (iii) Accepting food from a house-holder only when certain condition is fulfilled, (iv) Giving up the eating of tasty things, such as, *ghee*, oil, salt and sugar, (v) Living in the lonely places, (vi) Mortification of the body, (vii) Taking atonements for the violation of the rules of conduct, (viii) Paying reverence to the elderly saints and the perceptors, (ix) Rendering one's service to the elderly, diseased and old monks, (x) Renunciation of external and internal possessions, (xi) Study of the scripture and (xii) Meditation.

(h) Twenty-two hardships

The path of salvation is not an easy one. A monk is expected to overcome the hardships coming in the way of his *Sādhanā.* These hardships are twenty-two in number :

(i) Hunger, (ii) Thirst, (iii) Cold, (iv) Heat, (v) Insect-bite, (vi) Nakedness, (vii) Discontentment, (viii) Woman, (ix) Fatigue from walking, (x) Disturbance by animals, (xi) Sleeping or sitting on hard earth, (xii) Abuse, (xiii) Beating, (xiv) Begging, (xv) Failure to get alms etc., (xvi) Disease, (xvii) Contact of thorny shrubs etc., (xviii) Discomfort from dirt, (xix) Respectful or disrespectful treatment, (xx) Pride of knowledge, (xxi) Lack of knowledge and (xxii) Failures in religious practices.

Jaina-yoga and other systems of Yoga

As I have already mentioned, in early Jaina *āgamas* such as *Uttarādhyayana* etc. and in the works of Ācārya Kunda-kunda, we find a four-fold path instead of three-fold path, where in right austerity is mentioned separately from right conduct. According to *Uttarādhyayana* while the right conduct controls

the inflow of new *Kārmic* particles, i.e. *Āsrava* and thus, saves the soul from new bondage, it is the right austerity, which exhausts the pervious bondage of *Karmas*. For complete purification of self and perfect unfolding of the potentialities of the self, observation of right austerity is essential.

The pursuit of self-purification must culminate in realisation of the true nature of the self and according to Jainism the true nature of self is nothing but the state of equanimity or complete self absorption, in which self remains undistrubed by the flickerings of aversion and attachment. It is the state of *Nirvikalpa citta,* which can be acheived through the practice of meditation or *Yoga, i.e.,* the controlling of the activity of mind and body.

The word *Yoga,* in early Jaina literature, has a different sense. Jaina canonical works as well as Umāsvāti (*c.* A. D. 375-400) explain it as one of the five causes of bondage. If we go in the history of the meaning of the word *Yoga,* we find that in *Ṛgveda* and other early works of *Vedic* literature the word *Yoga* is used in the sense of connecting or yoking. In this very sense of connecting, the word *Yoga* is used in Jaina literature also. For Jainas *Yoga* means which connects the soul with *Kārmic* particles and thus, it is the binding principle. Later on, the term *Yoga* is adopted in the sense of the activities of mind, body and speech and it is considered that due to these activities that the soul comes into contact with the *Kārmic* particles which, inturn, bind the soul. Though in some early Jaina texts the word *Yoga* also means check or control upon the senses. In this very sense the term has also been used in some of the later *Upaniṣadas*. Though in *Vedic* tradition from the time of Pāṇini the term *Yoga* attained its technical meaning – *yuj-samādhau* and is explained as control of the modifications of mind (*yogaḥ-cittavṛttinirodhaḥ*), yet in Jaina tradition it is Haribhadra (active

c. A. D. 740-785), who for the first time defined the term *Yoga* in the sense of that which leads to emancipation (*mukkheṇa joyaṇāo jogo savvo dhammavāvāro – Yogaviṁśikā,* 1). Generally the term *Yoga* is equivalent to Jaina term *samyak-cāritra* but in its wider sense it includes *Samyak-darśana, Samyak-jñāna, Samyak-cāritra* and *Samyak-tapa* also. However in its narrow sense, we can equate it with Jaina process of meditation. If we compare Jaina *Yoga* with other systems of *Yoga* such as *Jñāna-yoga, Bhakti-yoga* and *Karma-yoga,* we find that Jainism being an integral system, accepts all these *Yogas*. *Samyak-darśana* of Jainism can be said to be equivalent to *Bhakti-yoga* and the *Samyak-jñāna* can be equated with *Jñāna-yoga*. So far as *Karma-yoga* and *Aṣṭāṅga-yoga* are concerned they may be compared with the *Samyak-cāritra* of Jainism. Though it must be borne in mind that owing to its philosophical foundations there are some peculiarities in the Jaina system of *Yoga*. For example, Jainism accepts the concept of devotion or *Bhakti,* yet in a different sense from a theistic philosophy, which believes in the concept of grace of God. Similarly the concept of *Jñāna-yoga,* in the sense of discriminative knowledge of self and not-self, is accepted by all the schools of *Jñāna-mārga*, but in minute details about the nature of ultimate reality and self, they also differ from each other. Same is the case with *Samyak-cāritra* and *Karma-yoga* also. With regard to their fundamental principles such as observance of non-violence, truth, non-stealing, celibacy and non-possession, they of course agree with each other but the details of their code of conduct, modes of *sādhanā* and worshipping differ from each other. So far as the concept of *Aṣṭāṅga-yoga* is concerned we find more similarity in both of the systems. The concept of five *yamas* of Patañjali's *Yoga-śāstra* is also present in the form of five great vows (*mahā- vratas*) in Jainism. Though the concept of *niyama*

is also found in both the systems, it differs in details, particularly *Īśvara praṇidhāna* is totally absent in Jainism. About the *Āsanas* or postures both the systems agree to a certain extent. Jainism approves those postures only which are benificial in meditation. The practice for regulation of breath or *Prāṇāyāma* is the pivot of Patañjali's *yoga-sādhanā,* but Jainism does not give much stress on the regulation of breath. It suggests only to be aware of or to concentrate on one's respirations or breathing system. The concept of *'pratyāhāra',* i.e., the withdrawal of senses is also present in both the system *in toto*. Though the concept of *dhāraṇā* is accepted by both the systems, but regarding its meaning they differ. For Jainas *'dhāraṇā'* means retention, while in Patañjali's *yoga* system *'dhāraṇā'* means fixing of mind on certain object and thus, it is a stage previous to meditation or *dhyāna.* Patañjali's *dhāraṇā* as well as *dhyāna* (meditation) are both included in Jaina concept of *dhyāna* (meditation). Not only this, Jainism uses the word *dhyāna* in such a wider sense that it comprehends *samādhi* also. Last two stages of *'śukla-dhyāna'* of Jainas are comparable with the two types of *samādhi* of Patañjali. Jaina *Āgamas* propound that emancipation can only be attained with the practice of all the modes simultaneously and jointly. As I have already mentioned that without right view-point or right-attitude, right-knowledge is impossible and without right knowledge our faith or belief will be blind and of no use in the path of spiritual development. Similarly without right-knowledge and right-faith, right-conduct or *samyak-cāritra* will be impossible. Thus the Jaina approach about the different *Yogas* is integral and comprehensive.

The Spiritual Nature of Jaina Festivities

Not only the Jaina course of discipline but also Jaina festivities are spiritual in nature. The Jaina festivities do not aim at entertainment; they are directed towards the spiritual develop-

ment of self through the practice of austerities. Among the festivals of the Jainas the well known one is the *Paryuṣaṇa*. It is celibrated in the month of *Bhādrapada* by both the sects. When the festival starts, the lay-followers of Jainism spend their time mostly in worshipping Jaina-icons, hearing religious discourses and reading the religious books (*svādhyāya*) and observe fasts and *proṣadha*. They do self-scrutiny everyday in the morning and evening by way of retrospection (*pratikramaṇa*). The Śvetāmbaras observe the last day of *paryuṣaṇa* as the *Saṁvatsarī-parva* and on that day they observe fast, attend the religious discourses, make self-criticism for any moral lapses, evil deeds and hostilities occuring during the year, and atonements are undertaken. On that day they ask forgiveness from all irrespective of friends or foes and declare

Khāmemi savve Jīvā savve jīvā khamantu me
Mitti me savvabhūesu veraṁ majjhaṁ ṇa kaṇae.

(*Āvaśyaka-sūtra,* 4. 32)

I forgive all living beings and pray that they all should forgive me. I am friendly to all living beings and bear no ill-will to anybody.

During these festive days, the observance of non-violence is also considered to be a primary duty. In ancient times many Jaina preceptors exercised their influence in getting these days marked out as non-violence days by the rulers.

In the Digambara sect *Paryuṣaṇa* is known as *Daśa-lakṣaṇa-parva*. They also observe it by doing *pūjā* (worship of Jaina-icons), studying religious books and undergoing the discipline of ten virtues, *viz.,* forgiveness, modesty, straightforwardness, truth, celibacy, etc. In addition to this main festival, *Ṣoḍaśa-karanabhāvanā*, *Navapada-olī, Aṣṭāhnika-parva, Akṣaya tṛtiyā, Śruta-pañcamī* and the day of conception, birth, initiation, enlightenment and emancipation (*Nirvāṇa*) of the *Tīrthaṅkaras*

are also observed as festive occasions. At the end of fort-night and four months (*caumāsī*) many Śvetāmbara Jainas observe fast and do retrospection (*Pratikramaṇa*). The days of birth and *nirvāṇa* of Bhagavāna Mahāvīra are also observed with great enthusiasm by the entire Jaina community.

Altruistic Attitude of Jainism

It is true that Jainism is a monastic religion. In its practice, special stress has been laid on self-purification and self-restraint, but from this it cannot be inferred that it is self centered and has no concern for the welfare of mankind. Jainism undoubtedly asserts that from the individualistic view-point, a chaste and seclusive life is more suitable, but at the same time it suggests that enlightenment or spiritual development obtained through penance should be utilised for social welfare. Mahāvīra's own life bears testimony to this fact. After spending twelve years in solitary austerities, he went back to society. He established a four-fold social order of monks, nuns, lay-men and lay-women and gave them guidance to the last moment of his life. Jainism admits the necessity of social-welfare and social service, but it should proceed from individual uplift. The individual is the primary unit of society, hence so long as individuals remain under the grip of passions there is no question of social amelioration. So long as the moral and spiritual consciousness is not developed in individual life, order and peace cannot be established in social life. The man who has no control over his selfish motives and desires cannot be socially fit. For rendering social service, one must be free from selfishness and should develop a sense of equality for other beings. An altruistic attitude is primarily needed for a social outlook; selfishness is destructive for social life. The institutions and communities that are formed for the fulfilment of selfish motives have no import on society. Do communities of thieves, robbers and exploiters deserve to be called

social units ? The teaching of Mahāvīra is that abstension in individual life can alone be the fountain-head of positive social welfare programmes. It is said in the *Praṣna-vyākaraṇasūtra* (2. 1. 1. & 2. 1. 4) that the preaching of the Lord is for the welfare of all the beings of the world. The five-fold discipline of non-violence, truth, non-stealing, sexual purity and non-possession (*Aparigraha*) is not for personal edification alone but it also aims at social good. The Jaina philosophers have always given priority to the good of others over the good of one's own. In Jainism, the ideals set for *Tīrthaṅkaras, Gaṇadharas* and *Sāmānya-kevalīs* and the distinction made among them are broadly based on the principle of universal good, communal good and individual good. The *Tīrthaṅkaras* have been given the highest position for their promotion of the universal good. The references of *Grāmadharma, Nagaradharma, Rāṣṭra-dharma,* etc. in *Sthānāṅga-sūtra* are indicative of the fact that Jainism is not confined only to individual good, but that it urges the universal good.

Does Jainism teach the Negation of Life ?

In Jainism more stress is given on austerities and renunciation of worldly enjoyments with the result that there is a wide-spread misconception that it teaches the negation of life. It will, therefore, not be irrelevant here to point out that the applause of austerities and renouncement does not imply non-recognition of physical and material life. The recognition of spiritual values does not mean that physical and material values should be completely rejected. According to Jainism, physical values are not hindrances to spiritual development, but are rather subservient to it. It is mentioned in the *Nisithabhāṣya* (4159) that, "Knowledge leads to salvation, the body leads to knowledge and food leads to (the nutrition of) body." The body is a vessel that ferries a person to the shore of eternal bliss. From

this point of view, fulfilment of bodily needs has both value and importance, the body is means to liberation and therefore deserves care. But it must be noted that our attention should be fixed not on the vessel – the means, but on the shore – the end to which it leads. As the vessel, body is a means and not an end. The recognition of physical and material values of life as means is at the core of Jainism and its entire spirituality. Here we have a line of demarcation indicating the difference between spiritualism and materialism.

In materialism, fulfilment of bodily needs and animal urges is an end in itself whereas in spiritualism it is only a means leading to the higher spiritual values. In Jainism both enjoyment and renunciation of worldly objects by an aspirant are needed for the cultivation of self restraint (*saṁyama*) and mental equanimity (*samatva*). The entire religious practices of Jainism aim at the development of an unruffled, unattached, dispassionate and peaceful life that is free from mental tensions and conflicts. The main issue is not the fulfilment or rejection of bodily needs but the establishment of peace in the life of individual as well as of society. Hence the fulfilment of bodily needs is welcomed to the extent to which it furthers this particular cause, but when it does not, it ought to be rejected. This view is beautifully presented in the *Ācārāṅga* and *Uttarādhyayana* (32/100-107). They say, when the senses come into contact with their objects, then the concommitant sensations of pleasure or pain also arise. It is not, possible in actual life to effectively alienate senses from the experiences of their objects and thus to exclude sensations of pleasures and pains. Hence what we must renounce is not the sense experiences but attraction or repulsion to them invoked in the mind. Attractions and repulsions (mental tensions) are the effects of the involvement of the self in pleasant or unpleasant sense-objects; they cannot arise in

an unattached and indifferent person. Thus the essential teaching of Jainism is the eschew- ment of attachment and not the negation of life.

Guṇasthāna

The journey of soul towards its spiritual heights is discussed in Jainism as a doctrine of *Guṇasthāna*. According to Jaina thinkers there are fourteen stages of spiritual development from the lowest level of perverse attitude (*mithyā-dṛṣṭi*) to the highest level of godhood (*siddhāvasthā*). In the *Samavāyāṅga, Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama* and in the works of Kundakunda and other Jaina thinkers we have a mention of these fourteen stages. These fourteen stages are technically called *Guṇasthāna*. *Guṇa- sthāna* refers to the stage of the soul at a particular stage in its spiritual development with reference to the nature of *jñāna, darśana* and *cāritra, i.e.,* knowledge, faith and conduct, through the operation, subsidence and destruction of *karma*.

1. The first stage is called ***mithyādṛṣṭi,*** *i.e.,* perversity of attitude. It is the lowest stage from where the spiritual journey of soul starts. It is considered as a stage of spiritual development because in this very state the efforts for the attainment of the right vision are made. The process of *granthibheda* occurs at this stage. At this stage the soul, is in the grip of exterme passions (*Anantānubhandhī kaṣāya*). The souls are of two types – *bhavya* (capable of attaining liberation) and *abhavya* (incapable of attaining liberation). *Abhavya* souls will remain in this stage for infinite time, while the *bhavya* souls will remain in this stage for a limited period of time. The perversity of attitude is of five kinds – (i) acceptance of one-sided view or the extremist view (*ekānta*), (ii) acceptance of the view, which is contradictory to the fact or reality (*viparīta*), (iii) veneration to the false creeds or the ritualistic views (*vinaya*), (iv) doubt or instability of faith (*saṁśaya*), (v) ignorance of the real nature of things (*ajñāna*).

This perversity of knowledge is due to the operation (*udaya*) of extreme forms of four passions, i.e., anger, pride, deceit and greed. One who is in the grip of these extreme forms of passions cannot attain the right vision or the right attitude.

2. The second stage is known as ***sāsvādana samyag-dṛṣṭi,*** i.e., to have a momentary taste of the right vision. This is an intermediate stage and it occurs when soul falls from the right attitude towards the perverse attitude. This is a doubtful stage before accepting the false belief with a fanatical perversity. This stage is called *sāsvādana samyagdṛṣṭi* because in this stage soul has a taste of the right attitude or right vision just as a person after eating delicious dishes, vomits and has a taste of those dishes in that state of vomiting. Prof. Kalghatgi explains this stage as a stage of hestitation before accepting the false belief (*Some Problems of Jaina Psychology*, p. 156).

3. The third stage is technically known as ***samyag-mithyā-dṛṣṭi.*** It is a mixed stage of the right and false attitudes like the taste of curd mixed with sugar, which is neither sweet nor sour. This is the stage of doubt. In this stage soul accepts neither the perverse attitude nor the right one. This is also an intermediate stage. Prof. Kalghatgi mention this stage as a stage of confusion. He writes, "After getting insight into the right attitude for the first time, it is possible that a man may at the same time begin to feel that what is right may not be right, and he may cling to false ideologies also" (*Some Problems of Jaina Psychology*, p. 156). This stage is the stage of active struggle between the right and the wrong. The right and the wrong both present themselves before the mind (consciouseness) and claim their righteousness, but the mind being incapable of taking any decision cannot select either of them. Thus this is the stage of indecisiveness of the mind to choose between the true and the false.

4. The fourth stage is ***avirata saṁyag-dṛṣṭi,*** a stage of right attitude without hesitation. Though in this scheme of *guṇasthāna* it is considered to be the fourth stage, but in reality it is the first stage in the upward journey of the soul towards its spiritual heights. It is the stage in which the soul gets the glimpse of truth for the first time. At this stage the self knows right as a right and wrong as a wrong but due to the lack of spiritual strength, in spite of the knowledge and the will he cannot abstain himself from the wrong-path of immorality. In other words, at this stage the soul lacks self-control. The soul can acquire next stage only when it overcomes this want. The persons, who have a steady faith in the doctrines of the Jaiṇas, but feel their unability to follow the moral code, come under this stage. One can achieve this stage by having control over one's extreme or intense passions (*Anantānubandhī kaṣāyas*) and through the subsidence (*upaśama*) or annihilation (*kṣaya*) of first four *prakṛtis* of *cāritra mohanīya karma* as well as *samyaktva mohanīya karma*.

5. The fifth stage is known as ***deśavirata samyagdṛṣṭi.*** This is the stage of right attitude with partial observance and partial non-observance of moral code. A house-holder who possesses right vision and observes five *aṇuvratas,* three *guṇavratas* and four *śikṣāvratas* comes in this category. In this stage one knows what is right and also tries to practise it but one connot have full control over one's paṣsions. At this stage there is only partial expression of the energy of self-control. After attaining the fourth stage, if one develops one's spiritual strength and has control over the second set of four passions, i.e., *apratyākhyānī-kaṣāya-catuṣka,* one is able to attain this stage. In this stage one posseses only partial power to control one's passions; but is not capable of complete abstinence from immoral activity because of the presence of a third set of four

passions (*pratyākhyānīkaṣāyacatuṣka*).

6. In spiritual journey of the soul the sixth stage is called ***pramatta-saṁyata-guṇasthāna.*** It is the stage in which the self observes right conduct fully. He observes five *mahāvratas* and other rules of moral conduct of a monk. Yet he has an attachment towards his body and due to this attachment the spiritual inertia is still there. Though he observes right conduct, yet he has a lack of self awareness. This is the stage of self-control with spiritual inertia. At the end of this stage the aspirant tries to subside or annihilate the third set of four passions and spiritual inertia and climbs the seventh ladder.

7. The seventh stage is the stage of self control and self awareness alongwith freedom from spiritual inertia, which is technically known as ***apramatta-saṁyata-guṇasthāna.*** At this stage the self has full control over his passions and observes the moral code without any negligence. He does not have any attachment towards his body. This stage can be attained by overcoming the nine types of *pramāda* or unawareness and the three sets of four types of passions. From this stage there are two ways open for the upward spiritual journey of the soul. They are technically known as *upaśama-śreṇī* and *Kṣapaka-śreṇī*. *Upaśama-śreṇi* is the path of suppression or subsidence while the *kṣapaka-śreṇi* is the path of annihilation. In the former, one climbs to the spiritual height through the suppression of the passions, but in the latter, one climbs to the spiritual height through the annihilation of passions. The person, who climbs the ladder of spiritual progress by suppressing his passions, is bound to fall from spiritual heights but the person who climbs up the ladder of spiritual heights through the annihilation of his passions ultimately attains *nirvāṇa* or emancipation.

For Jainas the spiritual development through suppression is not a right method of spiritual development.

8. The eighth stage of spiritual development is called ***apūrvakaraṇa.*** In this stage self attains a special purification and spiritual strength, and thus becomes capable of reducing the duration and the intensity of the previously bound *Karmas*. At this stage soul performs the four processes of *Karma-sthiti-ghāta* (destruction of the duration of *Karma*), *rasaghāta* (destruction of the intensity of *Karma*), *guṇa-saṅkramaṇa* (transformation of the quality of *Karmic* matter) and *apūrvasthiti-bandha* (bondage of an unprecedented kind of duration). The total process is technically known as *apūrvakaraṇa*. In this stage the soul for the first time experiences the spiritual bliss and tranquility, and emotional disturbances do not effect it much. At this stage the three sets of four passions alongwith anger and pride of the fourth set disappear, only subtle deceit and greed alongwith nine sub-passions (instincts) remain.

9. The ninth stage is named as ***anivṛttikaraṇa,*** because the process of *anivṛttikaraṇa* operates in this stage. It is also known as *bādara-sāmparāya guṇasthāna,* because in this stage there is occasional possibility of the soul being effected by gross passions (*bādara-sāmparāya*), although it has a power of control over them. At this stage, out of nine sub-passions (instincts) three types of sexual instinct subside and only six instincts and subtle greed remain, but due to the presence of sub-passions or instincts and subtle greed, a fear of attack by gross passions remain. At the end of this stage struggle for spiritual progress comes to an end and the soul climbs the tenth ladder.

10. This stage is named as ***sūkṣma-sāmparāya-guṇa-sthāna,*** because at this stage only subtle form of greed remains. This greed can be interpreted as the subconscious attachment of the soul with the body. When this subtle attachment alongwith remaining sub-passions is subsided or annihilated, the soul ascends to the next stage. The soul, which has made his spiritual

progress through the ladder of subsidence (*upaśama-śreṇī*) ascends to the eleventh *guṇasthāna* and the soul, which take up the ladder of annihilation (*Kṣapakaśreṇī*), climbs directly to the twelfth stage.

11. This stage is known as ***upaśānta-mohanīya-guṇa-sthāna;*** because in this stage deluding *karma* remains in the subsided form. It is the highest stage for those who ascend through the ladder of subsidence or suppression. But ultimately the suppressed passions arise and disturb the tranquility of mind. The soul invariably descends from this stage either to the sixth or fifth or fourth or even first stage. This is noteworthy that Jainism does not advocate the process of suppression of the passions for the spiritual progress. This view of Jainism is further supported by the modern psychologists such as Freud etc.

12. The twelfth stage in the spiritual development of the soul is called ***Kṣīṇamoha-guṇasthāna***. In this stage the deluding *karma,* which is the main obstruction in the spiritual progress, is completely destroyed. At the end of this stage the rest three *ghāti-karma, i.e., Jñānāvaraṇa, darśanāvaraṇa* and *antarāya* are also destroyed and the soul ascends to the thirteenth stage.

13. This stage is known as ***sayogī-kevalī-guṇasthāna.*** In this stage soul attains the four infinities, i.e., infinite knowledge, infinite perception, infinite bliss and infinite power and thus becomes omniscient. It is the highest stage of spiritual development. It is the stage of *Jīvana-mukti* of other systems of Indian Philosophy. Only due to the existence of four non-destructive *Karmas, i.e., āyu* (age),*nāma, gotra* and *vedanīya,* soul remains in the body till the span of age determining *karma* is not exhausted.

14. This stage is named as ***ayogī-kevalī-guṇasthāna,*** because in this stage the omniscient soul controls its activities

of mind, body and speech and thus prepares itself for the final emancipation. In this stage the remaining four non-destructive *karamas* are destroyed and the soul, after leaving the body, proceeds for its heavenly abode at the top of the universe and lives their for time-infinite.

Three Stages of Spiritual Quest

This spiritual quest of soul has been summarised into three stages :

1. The Extrovert Self (*bahirātmā*),
2. The Introvert Self (*antarātmā*) and
3. The Transcedental Self (*paramātmā*).

Ācārya Kundakunda, Svāmī Kārtikeya, Pūjyapāda, Yogīndu, Haribhadra, Ānandaghana and Yaśovijaya have mentioned these three states of spiritual quest in their respective works.

1. The Extrovert Self (*bahirātmā*) : One, who possesses perverse attitude and consequently does not discriminate soul from body, regards the external thing as mine and takes keen interest in the worldly enjoyment, is called an extrovert self. In other words, this is state of identification of the self with body and external belongings. This identification is due to the ignorance of the real nature of soul. The souls belonging to the first, second and third *guṇasthānas* fall in this category.

2. The Introvert Self (*antarātmā*) : The self, which possesses the right attitute and therefore clearly distinguishes the soul from the body and the other external belongings is called an introvert self. An introvert self does not take intrest in the worldly enjoyments, but meditates on one's own real nature and regards external belongings as foreign to it. This introvert self has been further subdivided into three states — (i) lower,

(ii) middle and (iii) higher. The self which possesses the right-vision or attitude but does not observe right-conduct is considered a lower introvert self. One which possesses the right-vision and also partially observes right-conduct is called middle introvert self. The self which possesses the perfect right-vision and observes the perfect right-conduct is called a higher introvert self. The soul belonging to the fourth *guṇasthāna* is called lower introvert self. The soul belonging to the fifth or the sixth stage of *guṇasthāna* is called middle introvert self and the soul belonging to the seventh to twelfth *guṇasthāna* is called higher introvert self.

3. The Transcendental Self (*paramātmā*) : The self, which is completely free from all sorts of impurities and passions such as aversion, attachment, pride, anger, deceit, greed, sexual desire and other sub-passions and which annihilates four types of destructive *karmas,* that obscures the real nature of self, is called transcendental self or *paramātmā*. According to Jaina tradition this type of self possesses four infinities, i.e., infinite knowledge, infinite perception, infinite bliss and infinite power. There are two categories of transcendental Self — (i) *Arhatas* and (ii) *Siddhas*. So long as the four types of non-destructive *Karmas* of transcendental self are not fully exhausted, the self remains in a physical body. It is called *Arhat* or *Jīvana-mukta.* For an *Arhata* is completely free from all types of impurities and defects, yet he is not free from his physical body, his soul is confined to his body. He works for the emancipation of worldly beings from their sufferings and preaches the truth to the world.

But when these four types of non-destructive *Karmas* are fully exhausted the soul of *Arhat* leaves this physical body and becomes *Siddha* or *Videha-mukta*. The perfect soul of

siddhas possesses the four infinities along with its unique and formless existence and resides at the top of the universe — *Siddhaśilā*. It is fully free from all types of obstructions and remains all the time in pure conscious attentiveness, *i.e., Sākṣī-bhāva* and equanimity, which is the ultimate goal of every soul that the Jaina *sādhanā* aims to achieve.

●

Chapter VII

Relevance of Jaina Sādhanā

We are living in the age of science and technology. The growth of scientific knowledge and technology have given new dimensions to our life and influenced each and every field of our way of living. Science has done a geat service to mankind by providing amenities of pleasant living and saved him from many miseries and uncertainities of the primitive past. It has also destroyed superstitions and religious dogmas, but at the same time it has also uprooted the moral, religious and cultural values of our society. Our traditional religious values and beliefs have been thrown away by this growth of scientific knowledge and out- look. We know much about the atom but not about the values needed for a meaningful and peaceful life. We are living in the state of chaos. Our life is full of excitements, emotional disorders and value conflicts. Thus our age is also the age of anxiety and mental tensions.

Today what is needed for a man, is mental peace and a complete integration with his own personality as well as with his social environment. Can religion, in general and Jainism in particular meet this need of our times ? Yes, it can. Religion for Jaina thinkers, does not mean some superstitions, dogmas and rituals, it has some eternal virtues and values, which can meet the needs of the time. First of all we should try to understand its real meaning and essence.

The Essence of Religion

Our fundamental question is what we mean by the term religion ? Many of the western scholars define religion as faith.

Prof. E. B. Taylor writes, "Religion is the belief in spiritual beings" (Quoted in *Dharma-darśana,* p. 28). Prof. Hoffding mentions, "Religion is faith in the conservation of values" (*Dharma-darśana,* p. 29). According to Jaina thinkers also the inner core of religion is faith, but it is the faith in our own existence and our own real nature, religion is a firm belief in some eternal and spiritual values which are more essential for the upliftment and existence of mankind. In the famous Jaina text *Kārtikeyānuprekṣā* (478), *dharma* (religion) is defined as the real nature of the things. If it is so, then question arises what is the real nature of human being ? Lord Mahāvīra has given two definitions of religion in *Ācārāṅga-sūtra* (1/1/8/3). He says, "Worthy people preach that the religion is mental equanimity." Equanimity is considered as a core or essence of religion, because it is the real nature or essence of all the living beings including human beings also. In a Jaina text known as *Bhagavatīsūtra* (1/9), there is a conversation between Lord Mahāvīra and Gautama. Gautama asked Mahāvīra, "What is the nature of soul ?" and Mahāvīra answered, "The nature of soul is equanimity." Gautama again asked, "What is the ultimate end of soul ?" and Mahāvīra replied, "The ultimate end of soul is also equanimity." Ācārya Kundakunda also equated the word *'samaya',* or *'samatā'* with *svabhāva* or essential nature of soul, further he also explained "*Sva-samaya* or *sva-svabhāva* is the ultimate goal of our life" (*Samayasāra*).

In Jainism, religion is nothing but a practice for the realisation of our own essential nature of *sva-svabhāva*. This enjoying of one's own essential nature means to remain constant in *sākṣībhāva* or *draṣṭābhāva.* It is the state of pure knowership or subjectivity. In this state the consciousness is completely free from constant flickerings, excitements and emotional disorders and mind becomes pacific. It is the pre-condi-

tion for enjoying spiritual happiness and the way to get freedom from mental tensions, which are the *vibhāvas* or impure states of mind. This is known in Jainism as *sāmāyika* or practice for equanimity or mind. Nobody wants to live in a state of mental tension, every one would like no tension but relaxation, not anxiety but satisfaction. This shows that our real nature is working in us for a mental peace or equanimity and religion is nothing but a way of achieving this mental peace. According to Jainism the duty of a religious order is to explain the means by which man can achieve the equanimity of mind or mental peace. In Jainism this method of achieving mental peace and equanimity is called *sāmāyika,* which is the first and foremost duty among six essential duties of the monks and the house-holders.

The three-fold path of right knowledge, right attitude and right conduct is only an application of equanimity (*samatva*) in the three aspects of our conscious life, i.e., knowing, feeling and willing. Even mindedness, broader and unbiased outlook and regard for others ideologies and thoughts are regarded as equanimity of knowledge or right knowledge. Detachment from the objects of worldly pleasures, balanced state of mind and the feeling of equality are considered as equanimity of feeling, i.e., right attitude or *samyak-darśana* and control over one's desires, regard for other's life and property, equal treatment in social life are known as equanimity of willing or right conduct. Again, right conduct consists of three organs, i.e., mind, body and speech. According to Jaina thinkers equanimity of mind, body and speech should be a directive principle of religious life. The equanimity of mind is non-attachment (*anāsakti* or *aparigraha*), equanimity of body is non-violence (*ahiṁsā*) and equanimity of speech is non-absolutism (*anekānta* or *syādvāda*). Non- attachment, non-violence and non-absolutism are the three pillars of Jainism and are fully competent to meet the needs of

our age and to establish peace and harmony in the world.

Non-attachment and Regard for Other's Necessities

As I have already mentioned that most burning problem of our age is the problem of mental tensions. The nations, who claim more civilised and economically more advanced are much more in the grip of mental tensions. The main objective of Jainism is to emancipate man from his sufferings and mental tensions. First of all we must know that what is the cause of these mental tensions. For, Jainism, the basic human sufferings are not physical, but mental. These mental sufferings or tensions are due to the our attachment towards worldly objects. It is the attachment, which is fully responsible for them. The famous text *Uttarādhyayana-sūtra* (32/9) mentions, "The root of all sufferings physical as well as mental, of every body including gods, is attachment towards the objects of worldly enjoyment." It is the attachment, which is the root cause of mental tensions.

If mankind is to be freed from mental tensions it is necessary to grow a detached outlook in life. Jainism believes that the lesser will be the attachement the greater will be the mental piece. It is only when attachment is vanished, the human mind will be free from mental tensions and emotional disorders. Jainism preaches the vow of complete non-possession for the ascetics and the vow to limit ones own possession for the householders, which are technically called as *aparigraha-mahāvrata* and *parigraha-parimāṇa-vrata* respectively.

Non-violance or Regard for Life

Samatā or equanimity is a personal or inner aspect of our religious life, when it is applied in the social life or it is practised outwardly, it becomes non-violence. Thus non-violence is a social or outer aspect of our religious life. In Ācārāṅga Lord Mahāvīra gives another definition of religion. He remarks — "The worthy men of the past, present and the future all say thus,

speak thus, declare thus, explain thus : all breathing, existing, living and sentient creatures should not be slain, nor treated with violence, nor abused, nor tormented. This is the pure, eternal and unchangeable law or the tenet of religion (*Ācārāṅga,* 2/4/127). In other words, non-violence is the eternal and pure form of religion. In Jainism non-violence is the pivot on which its whole ethics revolves. For Jainas violence represents all the vices and non-violence represents all the virtues. Non-violence is not a single virtue but it is a group of virtues. In *Praṣna-vyākaraṇa-sūtra* (2/1/21) the term non-violence is equated with sixty virtuous qualities, just as peace, harmony, welfare, trust and fearlessness, etc. Thus non-violence is a wider term, which comprehends all the good qualities and virtues.

The concept of non-violence and the regard for life is accepted by almost all the religions of the world. But none of the religions observe it so miniutely as Jainism. Jainism prohibits not only killing of human beings and animals but of the vegetable kingdom also. To hurt the plants is also an act of violence or *hiṁsā*. It's basic principle is that the life, in whatever form it may be, should be respected, we have no right to take another's life, because every one wants to live as we want. The *Daśavaikālika* mentions that every one wants to live and not to die, for this simple reason, *Nigganthas* prohibit violence (*Daśavāikalika-sūtra,* 6/10).

It can be said that the Jaina concept of non-violence is extremist and not practical, but we cannot challenge its relevance for human society. Though Jainism sets its goal as the ideal of total non-violence, external as well as internal, yet the realisation of this ideal in the practical life is by no means easy. Non-violence is a spiritual ideal, which is fully realisable only in the spiritual plane. The real life of an individual is a physio-spiritual complex; at this level complete non-violence is not pos-

sible. According to Jaina thinkers the violence is of four kinds— (i) deliberate or aggresive violence, i.e., intentional killing. (ii) protective violence, i. e., resorting the violence to save the life of one's own or his fellow being or to ensure peace and justice in the society, (iii) occupational violence, i.e., the violence which one commits in his occupation such as farming, tilling the soil or running factories and industries, (iv) violence, which is involved in preforming the daily routine work of a house-holder such as bathing, cooking, walking, etc. A person can proceed towards the completion of non-violent life to the extent as he rises above the physical level. The first form of violence which is deliberate, is to be shunned by all, because it relates to our mental proclivities. So far as the thoughts are concerned, a man is his own master, so it is obligatory for all to be non-violent in this sphere. The other forms of violence, i.e., protective, occupational and violence, involved in daily routine work are inevitable so far as man is living on a physical level. But this does not mean that the ideal of non-violence is not practicable and so it is not necessary for human race.

Non-violence is nothing but to treat all living beings as equal. The concept of equality is the core of the theory of non-violence. The preaching of non-violence is to honour the each and every form of life. Jainism does not discriminate the human beings on the basis of their caste, creed and colour. According to Jaina point of view, all the barriers of caste, creed and colour are artificial. All the human beings have an equal right to lead a peaceful life. Though violence is unavoidable, yet it can not be the directive principle of our living, because it goes against the judgements of faculty of reasoning and the concept of natural law. If I think that nobody has any right to take my life then on the ground of same reasoning I have also no right to take another's life; the principle 'live on others' or 'living by killng', is

self-contradictory. The principle of equality propounds that every one has the right to live. The directive principle of living is not 'Living on others' or 'Living by killing' but 'Living with others' or 'Live for others' (*parasparopagrahojīvānām, Tattvārthasūtra,* 5/21). In our world complete non-violence is not possible, yet our motto should be 'lesser killing is better living'.

Further we must be aware of the fact that in Jainism non-violence is not merely a negative concept, i.e., not to kill; but it has positive side also as service to mankind. Once a question was raised to Mahāvīra : "O Lord, one person is rendering his services to the needy persons while other is offering *pūjā* to you, between these two, who is the real follower of yours!" Mahāvīra answered, "First one is the real follower of mine, because he is following my teachings" (*Āvaśyakavṛtti,* pp. 661-662).

Though, inspite of all precautions violence is inevitable in our life, yet on this basis we can not conclude that the non-violence is not necessary at all. Just as violence is inevitable for living, non-violence is also inevitable for social living. So far as the existence of human society is concerned it depends on mutual co-operation, sacrifice of our interest for the sake of our fellow-beings and regard for others life. If above mentioned elements are essential for our social life, how can we say that non-violence is not necessary for human life. Society exists not on violence but non-violence, not on fulfilment of self-interest but sacrifice of self-interest, not on claiming for our own rights but accepting the rights of others as our duty. Thus we can say that the non-violence is an inevitable principle of the existence for human society. At present we are living in an age of nuclear weapons and due to this the existence of human race is in danger. It is only the firm faith in observance of non-violence, which can survive the human race. It is mutual credibility and the belief

in the equality of human beings which can restore the peace and harmony in human society:

Preservation of Ecological Equilibrium

Presently the most crucial problem of our age is, or for coming generation would be, that of ecological disbalance. Only a half centruy back we could not even think of it. But today every one is aware that ecological disbalance is directly related to the very survival of human race. It indicates lack of equilibrium or disbalance of nature and pollution of air, water, etc. It is concerned not only with human beings and their environment, but with animal life and plant-life as well.

Jainism, presents various solution of this ecological problem through its theory of non-violence. Jainas hold that not only human and animal beings but earth, water, air, fire and vegetable kingdom are also sentient and living beings. For Jainas to pollute, to disturb, to hurt and to destroy them means commit the violence against them, which is a sinful act. Thus their firm belief in the doctrine that earth, water, air, fire and vegetable paved a way for the protection of ecological balance. Their every religious activity starts with seeking forgiveness and repentance for disturbing or hurting earth, water, air and vegetation. *Jainācāryas* had made various restrictions on the use of water, air and green vegetables, not only for monks and nuns but for laities also. Jainas have laid more emphasis on the protection of wild-life and plants. According to them hunting is one of the seven serious offences or vices. It is prohibited for every Jaina whether a monk or a laity. Prohibitions for hunting and meat-eating are the fundamental conditions for being a Jaina. The similarity between plant-life and human life is beautifully explained in *Ācārāṅga-sūtra*. To hurt the plant life is as sinful as to hurt human life. In Jainism monks are not allowed to eat raw-vegetables and to drink unboiled water. They cannot enter the river

or a tank for bathing. Not only this, there are restrictions, for monks, on crossing the river while on their way to tours. These rules are prevalent and observed even today. The Jaina monks and nuns are allowed to drink only boiled water or lifeless water. They can eat only ripe fruits, if their seeds taken out. Not only monks, but in Jaina community some house-holders are also observing these rules. Monks and nuns of some of the Jaina sects, place a piece of cloth on their mouths to check the pollu- tion of air. Jaina monks are not allowed to pluck even a leaf or a flower from a tree. Not only this, while walking they always remain conscious that no insect or greenery is trampled under their feet. They use very very soft brushes made of threads to avoid the violence of smallest living beings. In short, Jaina monks and nuns are over conscious about the pollution of air, water, etc.

So far as Jaina house-holders are concerned they take such vows as to use a limited and little quantity of water and vegetables for their daily use. For a Jaina, water is more precious than *ghee* or butter. To cut forest or to dry the tanks or ponds is considered very serious offence for an house-holder. As per rule Jaina house-holders are not permitted to run such type of large scale industries which pollute air and water and lead to the violence of plant-life and animal-kingdom. The industries which produce smoke in large quantity are also prohibited by *Jainācāryas*. The types of these industries are termed as '*mahārambha*' meaning greatest sin and larger violence. It is considered as one of the causes for hellish life, thus Jainas take into consideration not only the violence of small creatures but even earth, water, air, etc. also. The fifteen types of industries and business prohibited for the house-holder are mainly concerned with ecological disbalance, pollution of environment and violence of living beings. Though *Jainācāryas* permitted agri-

culture for house-holders, yet the use of pesticides in the agriculture is not agreable to them, because it not only kills the insects but pollutes the atmosphere as well as our food items also. To use pesticides in agriculture is against their theory of non-violence. Thus we can conclude that Jainas were well aware of the problem of ecological disbalance and they made certain restrictions to abvoid this and to maintain ecological equilibrium for it is based on their supreme principle of non-violence.

Regard for Other's Ideologies and Faiths

Jainism holds that the reality is complex. It can be looked and understood from various view-points or angles. For example we can have hundreds of photographs of the same and one tree from different angles. Though all of them give a true picture of it from certain angle, yet they differ from each other. Not only this, but neither each of them nor the total of them can give us a complete picture of that tree. They individually as well as jointly will give only a partial picture of it. So is the case with human knowledge and understanding : we can have only a partial and relative picture of reality, we can know and describe the reality only from certain angle or view-point. Though every angle or view-point can claim that it gives a true picture of reality, yet it gives only a partial and relative picture of realily. In fact we can not challenge its validity or truth value, but at the same time we must be aware of the fact that it is only a partial truth or one-sided view. One, who knows only partial truth or has a one-sided picture of reality, has no right to discard the views of his opponents as totally false. We must accept that the views of our opponents may also be true from some other angles. Jaina theory of *anekāntavāda* emphasises that all the approaches to understand the reality give partial but true picture of reality and due to their truth-value from certain angle, we should have a regard for others ideologies and faiths. Thus *anekāntavāda* for-

bids us to be dogmatic and one sided in our approach. It preaches us a broader outlook and open-mindedness, which is more essential to solve the conflicts due to the differences in ideologies and faiths. Prof. T. G. Kalghatagi rightly observes, "The spirit of *anekānta* is very much necessary in society, specially in the present day, when conflicting ideologies are trying to assert supremacy aggressively. *Anekānta* brings the spirit of intellectual and social tolerance" (Vaishali Institute Research Bulletin, No. 4, p. 31).

For present day society what is awfully needed is the virtue of tolerance. This virtue of tolerance, i. e., regard for others ideologies and faiths is maintained in Jainism from its earlier times to the present days. Mahāvīra mentions in *Sūtrakṛtāṅga* (1/1/2/23) "those who praise their own faiths and ideologies and discard the views of opponents, distort the truth and remain confined to the cycle of birth and death." Jaina philosophers all the time maintain that all the view-points are true in respect of what they have themselves to say, but they are false in so far as they refute totally other's view-points. In famous Jaina text, *Isibhāsiyāiṁ* (3rd centruy B. C.) the views of different teachers of *Śramaṇic* and *Brāhmaṇic* trends like Nārada, Bhāradvāja, Gautam Buddha, Maṅkhali Gośāla and many others, have been presented respectfully. They are called as *Arhat-Ṛṣis* and their preachings are regarded as *Āgamas*. Here I would like to quote two beautiful verses of Haribhadra and Hemacandra (12th century A. D.) respectively which are the best examples of religious tolerance.

Haribhadra says : "I bear no bias towards Lord Mahāvīra and no disregard to Kapila and other saints and thinkers, whatsoever is rational and logical ought to be accepted."

Hemacandra says : "I bow all those who have overcome the attachment and hatred, which are the cause of worldly

existence, be they Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Śiva or Jina."

Jaina saints tried all the times to maintain the harmony in different religious faiths and to avoid religious conflicts. That is why Jainism can survive through the ages.

To solve the above discussed problems of present society as – mental tensions, violence, preservation of ecological equilibrium and conflicts of ideologies and faiths, Jainism advocates to observe and practise three basic tenets, i. e., non-attachment (*aparigraha*), non-violence (*ahimsā*) and non-absolutism (*anekānta*). If mankind observes these three principles, peace and harmony can certainly be established in the world.

●

Bibliography

Atharavaveda : Harayana Sahitya Sansthan, Rohatak, V. S. 2043.

Āurapaccākhāṇam : Edited by Muni Shri Puṇyavijayaji, *'Paiṇṇa-suttaim'*, Mahavira Jain Vidyalaya, Bombay, 1984.

Ācārāṅga : Edited by Shri Atmaramji Maharaj, Jaina Agama Prakashan Samiti, Ludhiyana, 1964.

Āvaśyaka Niryukti : Edited by Vijay Jinendra Surishvarji, Lakha-Bavak, Shantipur, Saurashtra, 1989.

Āvaśyaka Sūtra : Edited by Shri Madhukar Muni, Agam Prakashan Samiti, Beawar, 1985.

Iṣibhāsiyāim : Edited by Pt. Vinaya Sagar, Prakrit Bharti Akadami, Jaipur, 1988.

Uttarādhyayana : Edited by Sadhvi Chandanaji, Virayatan Prakashan, Agra, 2, 1972.

Upāsakadaśāṅga : Edited by Shri Madhukar Muni, Agam Prakashan Samiti, Beawar, 1980.

Kārttikeyānuprekṣā : Edited by Pt. Kailash Chandra Shastri, Parama Shruta Prabhavaka Mandal, Shrimad Rajachandra Ashram, Agas, Veer Nirvana 2584.

Gītā (Śāṅkarabhāṣya) : Gītā Press, Gorakhpur, Samvat 1995.

Jaina Sāhityā kā Bṛhad Itihāsa, Vol. 1-6 : Edited by Pt. Bechardas Doshi, P. V. Research Institute, Varanasi,1989.

Tattvārtha-sūtra : Umāsvāti, Edited by Pt. Sukhalalji Sanghavi, P. V. Research Institute, Varanasi, 1985.

Theragāthā : Edited by Pt. Rahul Sankrityayana, Uttam Bhikkhuna, Pakashito, Buddhabda 2481.

Daṁsaṇapāhuḍa : *Aṣṭapāhuḍa,* Kundakundācārya, Parama Shruta Prabhavaka Mandal, Agas, 1978.

Niyamasāra : Kundakundācārya, English Translation by Uggar Sain, The Central Jain Publishing House, Lucknow, 1931.

Niṣīthabhāṣya : Edited by Upadhyaya Amar Muni, Sanmati Jnanpeetha, Agra, 1958.

Puruṣārtha Siddhyupāya : Amṛtcandrācārya, Parama Shruta Prabhāvaka Mandal, Raichand Jain Shastramala, Bombay, Veer Nirvana 2431.

Pravacanasāra : Kundakundācārya, Ṭīkā by Manoharji Varni, Sahajanand Shastramala, Meerut, 1979.

Praśna-vyākaraṇa-sūtra : Edited by Shri Madhukar Muni, Agam Prakashan Samiti, Beawar, 1983.

Bhagavatī-sūtrā : Edited by Shri Madhukar Muni, Agam Prakashan Samiti, Beawar, 1982.

Bṛhadkalpabhāṣya : Edited by Muni Shri Chaturvijayaji, Shri Atmanand Jain Granthamala, Bhavanagar, 1933.

Mūlācāra : Vattakera, Edited by Pt. Kailash Chandra Shastri, Bharatiya Jnanpeetha, Delhi, 1972.

Yogaśāstra : Hemacandra, Jain Sahitya Vikas Mandal, Bombay 1931.

Ṛgveda : Edited and Translated by Maharshi Dayanand Saraswati, Dayanand Sansthan, New-Delhi-5.

Samayasāra : Kundakundācārya , Translated (in English) by J. L. Jaini, The Central Jain Publishing House, Ajtashram, Lucknow, 1930.

Samayasāra Kalaśa : Amṛtcandradeo, Edited by Pt. Phoolchandra Siddhantashastri, Shri Digambar Jain Mandir Swadhyaya Trust, Songarh, 1966.

Suttanipāta : Edited by Dharmanand Koshambi, Gujarat Vidyapith, Ahmedabad. 1931.

Sūtrakṛtāṅga : Edited by Shri Madhukar Muni, Agam Prakashan Samiti, Beawar, 1982.

Sthānāṅga : Edited by Shri Madhukar Muni, Agam Prakashan Samiti, Bewar, 1981.

English Books

1. The Path of Arhat by T. U. Mehta, P. V. Research Institute, Varanasi, 1993.
2. Some Problems in Jaina Psychology by T. G. Kalghatagi, Karnataka University, Dharawar, 1961.
3. Studies in Jain Philosophy by Nathamal Tatiya, P. V. Research institute, Varanasi, 1985.
4. The Heart of Jainism by Mrs. Sinclair Stevenson, Oxford University, 1975.
5. Jain Yoga by R. Williams, Oxford University Press, New York, Toronto, 1963.
6. Jain Path of Purification by Padmanabh S. Jaini, Motilal Banarasidass, Delhi, 1979.

●

हमारे महत्वपूर्ण प्रकाशन

1. Studies in Jain Philosophy — Dr. Nathmal Tatia Rs. 100.00
2. Jain Temples of Western India — Dr. Harihar Singh Rs. 200.00
3. Jain Epistemology — I. C. Shastri Rs. 150.00
4. Concept of Panchashila in Indian Thought — Dr. Kamala Jain Rs. 50.00
5. Concept of Matter in Jain Philosophy — Dr. J. C. Sikdar Rs. 150.00
6. Jaina Theory of Reality — Dr. J. C. Sikdar Rs. 150.00
7 Jaina Perspective in Philosophy and Religion — Dr. Ramjee Singh Rs. 100.00
8. Aspects of Jainology, Vol.1 to 5 (Complete Set) Rs. 1100.00
9. An Introduction to Jaina Sadhana — Dr. Sagarmal Jain Rs. 40.00
10. जैन साहित्य का बृहद् इतिहास (सात खण्ड) सम्पूर्ण सेट Rs. 560.00
11. हिन्दी जैन साहित्य का इतिहास (दो खण्ड) Rs. 340.00
12. जैन प्रतिमा विज्ञान – डॉ० मारुतिनन्दन तिवारी Rs. 120.00
13. जैन महापुराण – डॉ० कुमुद गिरि Rs. 150.00
14. वज्जालग्ग (हिन्दी अनुवाद सहित) – पं० विश्वनाथ पाठक Rs. 80.00
15. धर्म का मर्म – प्रो० सागरमल जैन Rs. 20.00
16. प्राकृत हिन्दी कोश – सम्पादक डॉ० के० आर० चन्द्र Rs. 120.00
17. स्याद्वाद और सप्तभंगी नय – डॉ० भिखारी राम यादव Rs. 70.00
18. जैन धर्म की प्रमुख साध्वियाँ एवं महिलाएँ – डॉ० हीराबाई बोरदिया Rs. 50.00
19. मध्यकालीन राजस्थान में जैन धर्म – डॉ० (श्रीमती) राजेश जैन Rs. 160.00
20. जैन कर्म-सिद्धान्त का उद्भव एवं विकास – डॉ० रवीन्द्रनाथ मिश्र Rs. 100.00
21. महावीर निर्वाणभूमि पावा : एक विमर्श – भगवतीप्रसाद खेतान Rs. 60.00
22. गाथासप्तशती (हिन्दी अनुवाद सहित) – पं० विश्वनाथ पाठक Rs. 60.00
23. सागर जैन-विद्या भारती भाग १, २ (प्रो० सागरमल जैन के लेखों का संकलन) Rs. 200.00
24. मूलाचार का समीक्षात्मक अध्ययन – डॉ० फूलचन्द जैन Rs. 80.00
25. स्याद्वाद और सप्तभंगी – डॉ० भिखारी राम यादव Rs.70.00
26. जैन तीर्थों का ऐतिहासिक अध्ययन – डॉ० शिवप्रसाद Rs. 100.00

पार्श्वनाथ विद्यापीठ, वाराणसी - ५